NUMBER 1

ANNALS OF THE ORGONE INSTITUTE

DIRECTOR: WILHELM REICH

EDITOR: THEODORE P. WOLFE

Love, work and knowledge
are the well-springs of our life.
They should also govern it.

ORGONE INSTITUTE PRESS NEW YORK

The ANNALS OF THE ORGONE INSTITUTE

continue the function of the *International Journal of Sex-economy and Orgone Research* published from 1942 to 1945. The ANNALS are published not in yearly volumes but in single issues, at irregular intervals.

MANUSCRIPTS must be typewritten, in final form, on paper 8½ x 11 inches, on one side only, double spaced, with left-hand margin of not less than one inch.

EDITOR'S ADDRESS: Dr. Theodore P. Wolfe, 401 East 56th Street, New York 22, N. Y.

ORGONE INSTITUTE PRESS
157 CHRISTOPHER STREET
NEW YORK 14, N. Y.

Congratulations to WILHELM REICH
on his fiftieth birthday, March 24, 1947

Reich and his son Peter, Maine, 1943

The ANNALS OF THE ORGONE INSTITUTE

continue the function of the *International Journal of Sex-economy and Orgone Research* published from 1942 to 1945. The ANNALS are published not in yearly volumes but in single issues, at irregular intervals.

MANUSCRIPTS must be typewritten, in final form, on paper 8½ x 11 inches, on one side only, double spaced, with left-hand margin of not less than one inch.

EDITOR'S ADDRESS: Dr. Theodore P. Wolfe, 401 East 56th Street, New York 22, N. Y.

ORGONE INSTITUTE PRESS
157 CHRISTOPHER STREET
NEW YORK 14, N. Y.

Congratulations to WILHELM REICH
on his fiftieth birthday, March 24, 1947

Reich and his son Peter, Maine, 1945

ANNALS OF THE ORGONE INSTITUTE

NUMBER 1 PRICE $2.00

CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION 3

ARTICLES

Work democracy in action — *Wilhelm Reich*, M.D. 4
Armored human beings versus the healthy child — *Felicia Saxe* 35
Sex-economy and orgone research in Palestine — *Walter Hoppe*, M.D. 73
About self-regulation in a healthy child — *Ilse Ollendorff* 81
The armored teacher — *Elizabeth Tyson* 91
Mechanistic thinking as the original sin — *R. H. Atkin* 95
Thoughts on the sex behavior of American soldiers in the ETO — *Anthony I. Swarowsky* 101

FROM THE HISTORY OF ORGONE BIOPHYSICS

Our congratulations to Freud on his birthday (1936) 108
The expulsion of Wilhelm Reich from the International Psychoanalytical Association 114

NOTES

A warning repeated 127
Some observations of children 128
Jerry's case 133
Again the common cold 138
A note on "specific diseases" 138

IN MEMORIAM

Fritz Brupbacher 140

REVIEWS

Ribble, Margaret A.: The Rights of Infants — *Mann* 142
Leonard et al.: The Child at Home and at School — *Tyson* 147
Aldrich, C. Anderson and Mary M. Aldrich: Babies Are Human Beings — *Tyson* 153

Copyright, 1947

Orgone Institute Press, Inc.
157 Christopher Street
New York 14, N. Y.

PRINTED IN THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

INTRODUCING THE ANNALS OF THE ORGONE INSTITUTE

At a time when scientific work is still in full development, changes in the work may necessitate changes in the mode of publication. The establishment of the Annals of the Orgone Institute corresponds to such a necessity. The Annals continue the functions of the International Journal of Sex-Economy and Orgone Research published from 1942 to 1945. Among the factors which necessitated the change are the following:

In the Journal, the emphasis was on *sex-economy*, with orgone research appearing as a developmental product of sex-economy. This no longer is in keeping with the facts. Today, *orgone biophysics* is leading; it determines thinking and working also in the field of sex-economy. The accent shifted more and more from psychiatry to natural science, to biology and physics. Our attitude toward early upbringing, also, is determined predominantly by our orgone-biophysical insights into the child as a living organism. With that, the sexological and psychological functions do not lose any of their significance; they are, however, put in a wider framework and on a deeper basis, that of biology.

The Journal having been published in yearly volumes, we were held to certain deadlines; increasing paper shortage and other conditions in the printing business made it increasingly difficult to meet these. We also had to adhere to a certain number of pages. These mechanical requirements restricted our freedom of mobility. For this reason, the Annals will not be published in yearly volumes, but in single numbers, appearing at irregular intervals and of irregular volume. The resulting flexibility in the mode of publication corresponds better with our functional way of thinking and working than the rigid form of a Journal.

The Annals represent the organ of the Orgone Institute. However, as before, each individual author is alone responsible for the contents of his publication.

For the Orgone Institute
Wilhelm Reich

WORK DEMOCRACY IN ACTION*

By WILHELM REICH, M.D.

The work groups in various countries differ greatly in experience, specialization, capacity of achievement and social influence. The difference in maturity is part of the *pioneer* character of the work as a whole. There are, as a result, a great many problems which represent problems of *growth*. The Institute does not form a homogeneous group of specialists with the same degree of training and achievement. There are, e.g., teachers who do as yet not know what to do with orgone physics. There are, on the other hand, sociologists with a socialist orientation who are still deeply rooted in pre-war ideologies or even in party ideologies and who find it difficult to keep pace with our *work-democratic* social orientation. Again, there are good therapists and teachers who never have had any practical contact with social problems, or students of biology who have no contact with the sociological matrix from which orgone biophysics grew more than a decade ago.

Orgone biophysics, the new theory of living functioning, forms, as does its object of study, an indivisible *functional unity*. It is to be feared that to this functional unity a *functional antithesis* and *antagonistic splitting up* will soon be added, unless we take into account the disparity in maturity.

One cannot expect a teacher to keep pace with the biophysicist who works on the identity of static electricity and atmospheric orgone. Nevertheless, the teacher will have to understand what the "biological energy" with which he works actually represents.

One cannot expect of the average vegetotherapist who treats patients many hours a day that he master the classical fundament of sociology which has so many connections with our mass psychology. Nevertheless, he must be conversant with the social processes which produce the emotional diseases.

Finally, one cannot expect a man who daily experiences sociology in his work as social worker or journalist to be able to follow the principles of orgone-biophysical research. Nevertheless, he must have a certain knowledge of living functioning.

The more closely one's work is connected with everyday social living,

* Translated by the Editor.

the more one will be inclined to emphasize the social element in our work, at the expense of the natural-scientific. It is precisely this type of practical worker who most drastically experiences the deep chasm between long-view natural science and short-view practical work. Unless he has a broad view of things, he may even be inclined to regard orgonometry as a flight from hard reality, as an "unwarranted academic luxury." Orgone biophysics, however, is experimental natural science and thus must have a sound foundation in mathematical (orgonometric) laws. I may say here that orgonometry has already found its confirmation in well-established classical calculations of astronomy. It will be a long time, however, before these results are ripe for publication.

The chasm, then, exists practically. It is bridged only theoretically by the basic orgone-biophysical concepts of the unitary character of all life manifestations. We are still very far from a practical mastery of this deep chasm between natural science and practical social endeavor. This is the reason for many dangerous situations with which the Institute has been confronted in the past and will be confronted in the future.

Although, in reality, *science* and *society* form an indivisible unity, the *practical* aspect of the problem is exceedingly complex, namely, the combination of "science and politics," or, better, the development of a "socially conscious science," of "social endeavor based on natural science." The chasm between natural science and practical social endeavor occasionally manifests itself in the form of irrational behavior on the part of the representatives of science as well as those of politics. It is precisely at the point where the natural scientist meets the gigantic demands of the social chaos and where the practical worker meets the demands of strict natural science that political irrationalism enters the arena and confuses thinking, disrupts human relationships, and leads with logical inevitability to murder, when defamation, gossip and other, milder, manifestations of the emotional plague no longer suffice. Formation of cliques, intrigues, personal irrational enmity, irrational ambition, envy and hatred are sure indications that the conflict between slow-working, penetrating natural science and politics with its everyday demands has led to a crisis. Careful investigation of such "political differences" again and again discloses the conflict between scientific principle and the demands of everyday social life. Let us go a step further in order to better understand this conflict and, if possible, to solve it for our organization. *How does the irrational mechanism of the emotional plague set in?*

Every human individual, without exception, has the tendencies to emotional plague reactions in himself. The difference in practical behavior is not determined by the existence or non-existence of such mechanisms. It is determined by the ability to sense, understand and control these plague mechanisms in time. I do not hesitate to admit that I am not always capable of recognizing these tendencies *in time*. No human being is excepted from this fate. The best way is to wait quietly until the situation becomes cleared, and never to act as long as one is under the influence of plague reactions. It goes without saying that our work has to be protected by an alteration of structure through character-analysis and orgone therapy. He who is already healthy in our sense is less apt to become dangerous than he who is rigidly armored; nevertheless, this applies to him also.

The following is based first, on clinical experience with individuals suffering from the emotional plague, second, on numerous experiences with co-workers in the course of about 20 years of teaching, and, third, on self-observation. I might add a study of the behavior of political leaders in times of social crises. The contentions to follow, then, are not accidental personal opinions, but a scientifically founded *explanation*. This explanation shifts the emphasis from the individual to where it belongs, namely, the realm of our *biosocial functioning*.

It is only in the course of the past few years that the problem has become as clear as it is now. Before that time, I felt completely helpless in the face of the ever-recurring catastrophes in my work which appeared like an inevitable fate. I could not understand the thing, did not know what to do about it and suffered from the justified self-reproach that a gap in my understanding was in part responsible.

The teaching and research structure of *orgone biophysics* of today is composed of analytic depth psychology, biology of the instincts, physics of the instincts, sociology of the instincts and mass psychology, organ pathology, clinical medicine, pedagogics and, last not least, social politics. So many specialties, and, correspondingly, so many specialists?, the reader will ask.

It was my task to master these manifold and co-existing things. This would be impossible if this co-existence had not derived from a logical sequence of things, which was somewhat as follows:

1918-1924 essentially natural science (physics, chemistry, biology, medicine) and natural philosophy; developed up to date.

1920-1930 classical sexology, psychoanalysis and psychiatry; developed up to date.

1923-1944 clinical *orgasm theory* and *sex-economy*, as a new, autonomous field.

1927-1936 classical sociology, and foundation of social sex-economy.

1932-1937 vegetotherapy, breakthrough into the biophysical foundation of the emotional plague.

1934- bio-energetic research.

1939- orgone physics, orgone biophysics and orgone therapy.

When, about 1922, I gave myself over completely to psychoanalysis, this shift in main interest led to the loss of a number of valuable friends who remained with classical natural science and since became mechanistic biologists, chemists or physicists. There is no longer any contact with them, but the separation created no enmities.

When, between 1923 and 1926, I began to develop my orgasm theory, I lost a number of good co-workers among the psychoanalysts; some became bitter enemies who later resorted to defamation; the conflict with Freud also developed at that time. On the other hand, the young theory won new and enthusiastic co-workers among the psychoanalysts in the technical seminar in Vienna and Berlin, and later in Copenhagen and Oslo.

When, after 1927, I established practical contact with sociology and developed my social sex-economy, many Marxists became my friends and co-workers, at the expense of another number of friendly psychoanalysts.

When, at the time of the German catastrophe, I began the criticism of party-political thinking (Mass Psychology of Fascism, etc.), many party politicians became enemies: social sex-economy and structural psychology made too high demands. I found myself alone, outside the psychoanalytic as well as the political organizations of Europe.

At this time, a new campaign of defamation began against me and my co-workers; this was waged by the politicians under the slogans of "Freudianism, sexualism" and by some psychoanalysts, successfully at first, with the slogan "schizophrenia."

I lost my students from the psychoanalytic seminars. Not one of them remained; not one of them took the step into character-analysis and later biophysics. This was the hardest blow of my scientific career.

When, in 1937, I had to take the difficult step from the purely psychological method of character-analysis to the biophysical technique of vegeto-

therapy, I lost again several important and capable co-workers, among them the influential director of the Psychological Institute of a university. However, most of the physicians, psychologists and teachers trained by me after 1933 withstood the pressures and came along, often with great difficulties, but more often with enthusiasm. Today, most of them are independent leaders of work groups. Since they were not hampered by other organizational bonds, they were able to follow the bion research after 1934 with interest and understanding. But very often it was difficult to keep together the already widely scattered activities. Social sex-economy, clinical sex-economy, mass psychology and vegetotherapy went well together where the scientific contact was close. Where it was not, the usual irrationalism took the place of cooperation.

A new rupture threatened when, in 1939, I had to concentrate my attention on the newly discovered orgone. However, the development of cancer research from bion research and from clinical sex-economy brought new friends with much understanding, for now the close connection between the disrupted human sex-economy and the cancer scourge was clear.

The political chaos in Europe hampered the development of mass-psychological work; on the other hand, the interest in the natural-scientific work grew. It was clear that *orgone biophysics was not a development away from sociology; rather, it promised a better foundation for our sociological work*. The problem, however, as to whether, in these catastrophic times, the socio-political or the natural-scientific work deserved preference in effort, remained acute.

I must point out here a significant change in our social orientation which still creates a certain amount of confusion. Many of our co-workers had either come from socialist circles or had personal or ideological connection with them. I myself had for years worked as a physician in socialist organizations, and my mass-psychological publications were not only basically sex-economic but were also strongly colored by socialist views.

Then, a sharp conflict developed in our socio-political position. On the one hand, it was clear that Marx's sociology and economics could provide theoretical and practical connections with our sexual sociology. We, however, were in the first place natural scientists, physicians and teachers, while the Marxists were primarily politicians. We came from psychoanalysis or other branches of natural science; the representatives of politics, however, came from party circles. There followed the *backward* movement of politics and the *forward* movement of our natural science, rapidly widening the chasm between science and politics:

1. The "peace parties" of central and northern Europe did not understand the irrational biopsychological content of fascism; there are no indications that such an understanding has come about since that time. We, on the other hand, began, after 1933, to understand fascism better and better. The understanding of fascist irrationalism today (outside of party politics) is the result of our pioneer work. For we were *the first to comprehend the problem of fascism mass-psychologically and sex-economically and to make it widely known*.

2. In the Soviet Union there was a regression, step by step, from a revolutionary to the authoritarian, nationalist principle, in economics and social sex-economy, a regression which today has reached the stage of propaganda for families with many children, to the reintroduction of reactionary sexual legislation, bemedaled generals, church hierarchy, abolition of coeducation, etc. We, on the other hand, had gone beyond the confines of psychology, had given our previously only psychological and sociological theory of character a foundation in biophysics and had established the following facts: *The sexual energy is the life energy per se*, and, *Human character structure anchors the social process by means of sexual energies*.

In their retrogressive development, the politicians developed an increasingly bad conscience and correspondingly increasingly sharp measures against us who continued to adhere to the idea of internationalism and worked on the BIOLOGICAL *basis of the productive power, working power*. The bad conscience of the political Left wing explains the fact that most of the attacks and defamations of any weight came from the camp of the socialist politicians. In Germany they came from the Communists as early as 1932, when the concepts of social sex-economy became widespread among masses of people; later, in Scandinavia, they came from members of socialist organizations.

The break with the old political organizations became complete, while the connection with Marx's sociology became firmer. We understood why the political organizations became the victims of fascism; it was because their lack of understanding of race mysticism, of social sex-economy and of biopsychiatry. We also knew where economics required complementation with depth psychology, where we were able to correct concepts and to fill gaps in the understanding of the biosocial process. Gradually, we arrived at the insight that social development proceeds from the *many-*

party-system over the *one*-party-system (dictatorship) to the *no*-party-system, to natural *work democracy*. A new social conflict appears on the horizon: that between the *world of work* and the *world of politics*.

More and more clearly, we saw that *the pathological character of politics has its foundation in the biopathic character*, in the rigid armoring and fear of life of the mechanized, armored animal, man, which is unable to live without political leaders. The more deeply our research progressed into biophysics, the clearer these facts became, but the greater also our impotence. For now we knew better than before *how deeply* in the biological foundation of man his social misery is anchored, and how gigantic is the biosocial catastrophe of the animal, man.

To the same degree we removed ourselves from everyday politics in which even the best and most honest socialists and liberals had become entangled. We understood the resistance on the part of the responsible politicians against taking cognisance of the magnitude of the problem represented by the "society of the irrationally reacting animal, man." For the more one learned about it the more hopeless it appeared, the more dreadful seemed the social illusion of the possibility of progress *without eliminating that human structure which craves a Führer*.

The more urgently everyday politics called for practical measures, the more sharply stood out the finding of natural science: The social misery has its roots far, far deeper down than we dare acknowledge. It is anchored in the armored character structure of the masses of people. Dictators are not important. Important are only the masses of people. They alone bear the responsibility. They alone can become victorious over themselves. Man is the only animal which has lost contact with life, which became rigid and out of its biological rigidity created the present chaos. The prerequisite for any genuine movement for freedom is the elimination of the conditions and institutions which create character armoring.

This was a shattering realization. How senseless is it to fight dictators and political machines alone! This would change nothing, for the helpless, authority-craving masses would immediately create new dictators of one kind or another, and submit to them. Fascism owes its power to the social helplessness of the masses and the unconscious sympathy of many democratic politicians for fascism (Munich, 1938; Stalin-Hitler pact, 1939).

I do not believe that anyone can envisage the extent and depth of human biopathy who does not continually deal with it professionally. By referring to our findings, somewhat contemptuously, as "simple formulae," he betrays complete ignorance of the tremendous complexity of the "simple" facts of sex-economy. This ignorance of the complex nature of our simple contentions is of no lesser danger for the real mastery of the emotional plague than human biopathy itself. He who has such a concept of sex-economy will soon get into insuperable difficulties and will fail in practical reality. He will attempt *ideological* instead of practical solutions. "Affirmation of adolescent sex life" sounds simple, matter-of-course and "revolutionary"—ideologically. But let one try *practically* to remove, say, the obstacles which a youth group meets in the path to a healthy sexual life. Then, one will inevitably fail unless one knows where to look for the enemy: in the party secretary who is worried about the "purity" of the party ideology, the school director who fears for his job, and—in the adolescent himself who suffers from orgasm anxiety, not even to mention ministers and district attorneys of whatever party ideology.

Fascism grew, weedlike, not only in the circles of capitalists but also in the circles of "the little man." That the capitalists used fascism for their purpose, *once it was there*, and that again the little man got the dirty end of the stick, is another story. If fascism is to be beaten definitively, we must keep clearly in mind that all the nationalist dictatorships which kindled the world war derived their strength from the suppressed masses. This has nothing to do with economics directly; it is the expression of the mass structure, a biopsychological problem which calls for mental hygiene measures on a gigantic scale. No sociologist or politician of the past century could have predicted *that the suppressed masses themselves would one day support the irrational political St. Vitus's dance*.

This was clear in 1939, and the war confirmed these insights. But I did not dare write it down until 1942 and it was not published until 1943 ("The biological miscalculation in the human struggle for freedom," *Internat. J. of Sex-economy and Orgone Research*, 2, 1943, 97-121).

Our biosocial insights did not derive from any political interest; on the contrary, they contradicted it. They paralyzed any practical social initiative, for how would one practically master the rigidity of the masses? Nevertheless, we knew that we had seen things correctly and had drawn the correct conclusions. The hatred, the defamations and persecutions which came our way are due, in the last analysis, to the deadly fear of the armored individual of our recognition, that is, *of recognizing himself*. The more we disassociated ourselves from politics and took a long-range view on a natural-scientific basis, the closer we came in reality to social achievement,

the more did we become genuine democrats, work democrats. The demand for an answer to the gigantic problem became more and more urgent. But correct answers cannot be forced in a hurry, particularly to historical social questions. They gradually come about by themselves, according to the law of organic growth of scientific insights. Rash solutions have always proven erroneous, as is clearly shown, for example, by the outcome of the French as well as the Russian revolution. Since none of us made any claim to political leadership, we could wait. We could not have helped anyhow, and there are enough political noisemakers. The relinquishment of political leadership was indispensable if one was to adhere to the *basic problem* of the social tragedy. But it was clear to us that a great social responsibility had become ours; the form of its practical realization will result spontaneously from the further process, if we remain honest.

We know some of the basic reasons for the tragedies of the social revolution, the most important of which is the disrupted biological functioning of the animal, man. Biologically rigid masses of people who are incapable of freedom, cannot suddenly create a genuine democracy. We know theoretically what social measures would be necessary to do the spade work. But practically we have against us not only the powerful apparatus of the organized emotional plague, ready at all times to destroy our existence; more than that, *the masses of people themselves, infested as they are by this same emotional plague, would not let us act.* This is inherent in the facts. It is the most cruel of all facts that the social misery stems from the biological rigidity and fear of life of the masses of people themselves. We have proven this fact. The proofs are everywhere: on the street, at a boxing match where 50,000 people cheer, in the mental hospitals and the wealth of biopathic diseases. Whoever has eyes to see, can see it. To those who cannot see it it cannot be shown. Limiting one's efforts to small circles will lead nowhere. Such a limited attempt would easily be nipped in the bud by the overwhelming majority of life-inimical cultural circles. The political achievement in a small sector of society would be no more than a drop in an ocean of misery. The natural-scientific approach promised no immediate practical action, but it led into the general social problem.

This contradiction between present-day political demand and slow natural-scientific maturing of long-range actions often leads to irrational reactions in our co-workers when they are not able to adapt to the situation. If one feels helpless practically, one cannot retreat to patient scientific

viewing and waiting unless one is engaged in productive scientific research. If, on the other hand, one is engaged in scientific work only, one is apt to lose the social perspective necessary to do what is possible at the right moment. One may then be inclined to become an irrational rebel, or to look down on those with primarily social interests as "non-professionals." In either case, helplessness in the face of the gigantic problem is at work; it will inevitably lead to irrational actions unless one has learned to master one's plague reactions. I might be able to save others some errors by relating my own development in the conflict between science and politics.

Until the end of the first world war I was a naive member of the big human herd, that is, "unpolitical," full of views none of which survived for five years, oppressed by material struggle, etc. Thus I know the little, unpolitical man very well from my own experience. I also was unscientific, for in the college teaching of the old Germany and Austria there was no scientific stimulation. Then, between 1917 and 1927, I became conscious of the nature of science. When political unrest began in Austria in 1927, social interest was added to the scientific. Suddenly, I saw the gigantic contradiction of scientific life and everyday political life. There seemed to be no connection between the two realms; more than that, they seemed to contradict each other. Marx offered sociological science and social direction at one and the same time. Marxism was the only sociological orientation in Europe which pointed *forward*.[1] Then began the sociological criticism —which is still correct—of my scientific psychiatric work. The ensuing 10 years showed this criticism to be highly fruitful for both research and social activity. But the conflict of "science *or* politics" remained insoluble. One could not be researcher and party politician at one and the same time.

So I remained medical researcher, but every scientific fact now came to be scrutinized according to two basic questions:

1. What is the attitude of the ruling public opinion toward this fact?
2. What are the practical social consequences of this fact?

Thus social sex-economy grew out of clinical sex-economy. The practical consequences usually were immediately obvious, such as the social affirmation of natural infantile and adolescent sexuality, or the responsibility of the worker for the social process of production, things which now, 18 years

[1] Until 1939, I knew the nature of the American revolution only from a distance. I cannot enter here upon the vast difference between the American and the European concept of freedom.

later, are the focal points of active struggle. But the question in 1930 was, who should advocate these practical consequences? The obvious answer was: the political parties who, among other things, had included rational sex-political aims in their programs. These were the communist, socialist and liberal organizations. Thus I began to work in the framework of these three organizations.

Later, I found out a tremendous miscalculation. That it took me so long to correct it was due to the erroneous orientation of the freedom organizations in questions of mass psychology.

The miscalculation was the following: *Here* is political reaction which suppresses and exploits the masses. *There* are the masses who are oppressed and yearn for freedom. All one has to do, therefore, is to stimulate, organize and lead these masses, so that they throw off the social shackles of political reaction and create freedom in the world. Accordingly, I organized the Austrian and later the German Sexpol. The task of sex-politics was to provide the masses with rational biosexual knowledge as the economic parties provided them, or tried to provide them, with economic knowledge.

It must be remembered that at that time, fascism was not yet in power; there was as yet no biophysical theory of human depth structure beyond the distinction between "primary" and "secondary" impulses; there was no inkling yet of the characterological anchoring of social suppression in the people themselves. It was believed that social sex-affirmation would be sufficient to master the sexual neuroses. One was convinced that the masses of people had a burning desire for a free life. Their structural fear of freedom and incapacity for freedom was as yet unknown.

Then came the social teachings of the world events: fascism, which is extreme despotism, won over millions of people. This event raised, for the first time in the history of sociology and mass psychology, the question as to *how it is possible that suppressed masses follow political reaction and carry it to power*. I must emphasize the fact here that I was the first to formulate this question in 1930. Today it is widely discussed, usually without mention of its source. I emphasize my priority because I alone had to carry the ***responsibility*** for the ***sex-economic*** aspect of the problem while other mass psychologists attempted to comprehend the behavior of the masses in a socially harmless and dangerless manner. With this question, the social accents became shifted: ***What was important was no longer the reactionary Führer or capitalist, but exclusively "human nature," that is,***

the human character structure which not only accepted suppression but actually affirmed and furthered it.

It was, then, no longer a matter of suppression on the Right and of being suppressed on the Left. Rather, *social suppression was at work in the people themselves;* not, however, as the manifestation of an allegedly biological "death instinct" or "need for suffering," as a degenerated psychoanalytic theory put it, but, as sex-economy was first to find, *as the result of socially conditioned rigidity of the human plasma functions which in turn make society mechanistically rigid*. If one does not understand this, one cannot follow a single step of our work. It was essentially this social problem which forced my clinical work into a direction which, a few years later, produced a scientific insight of the first order in the "muscular armor" and "characterological helplessness." Study of a social problem had fructified medical research.

With the shifting of the social accent from small groups, political parties, individual great men, etc., to the character structure of the masses of people, the Sexpol collapsed, for it had been based on the erroneous concept that "Right is black" and "Left is white." The dissemination of the natural-scientific findings of sex-economy among the masses met such great difficulties, and finally failed, because it could only penetrate the armoring of the mass individual but not dissolve it. Experience showed again and again that people who were attracted by sex-economy not only had genuine interest, but, on the other hand, *also secondary impulses and a pornographic sexual structure* which made a *responsible* way of living in the sex-economic sense impossible. The pornographic view of sexual life was too deeply rooted and too much socially supported; natural genitality was too disturbed and socially ostracized to allow—as had been my earlier belief—sexual self-regulation and natural functioning. The *longing* for happiness did not have a foundation in the *capacity* for happiness. More than that, political reaction of a Mussolini or Hitler came from the masses; the masses themselves showed themselves to be primarily reactionary. As amazing and painful as this fact was at first, it was matter-of-course when one became used to it: when the masses of people have been kept ignorant for centuries and filled with erroneous, superficial slogans, and kept from regulating their lives themselves, society only reaps the fruits of its crime against these masses. The realization of these facts made the economistic point of view of the "Left" parties untenable, for this point of view counted on unequivocally progressive human structures. Clinical experi-

ence shows the masses to be as reactionary as progressive. This makes clear the necessity of still more radical social measures but also removed us more and more from *practical* everyday possibilities. The biological rigidity of the masses made a mass organization *against* the parties impossible. Thus, everyday politics receded more and more into the background, whether we wanted to or not.

More and more, events showed our views to be correct. In Germany, after loosening of the compulsive moralistic fetters, the *secondary, sadistic and perverse* impulses broke through the armor. In the Soviet Union, there was a rapid regression to an authoritarian regime in economy and sex-politics. Unlike the Russians, we knew *why* this regression was "necessary," that is, inevitable. We keep adhering to *the original goal of social and individual self-regulation,* while they do not; *we continue to search for the path to social self-regulation,* while they have given themselves over to illusions. This is because we follow conscientiously the sex-economic process in the individual and in society, while they discard the whole problem of mass psychology as "unproletarian." From a long-range point of view, it makes no difference whether our point of view will be generally recognized as correct and useful in 10 or in 100 years. The responsibility for the millions of human lives lost through the prevailing social shortsightedness is not only ours, but that of the masses.

If, then, one were to avoid catastrophes and at the same time to adhere to the original goal, sex-politics in the framework of party-political organization was out of the question. But there was absolutely nothing that could have taken the place of the old, party-oriented sex-politics. One cannot treat vegetotherapeutically millions of people in order to replace the secondary, perverse impulses by natural genitality. True, it is possible, by way of penetrating clarifications, to smash armorings *en masse;* but what then comes to the surface is brutal irrationalism and not what we strive for: rational self-determination of life.

The alteration of human structure, its de-armoring and the elimination of the secondary, pornographic and sadistic impulses, requires not only a knowledge of the deep biological processes even in the newborn, but also a social environment in which these processes can function in a natural manner. Any kind of authoritarian or mystical form of living makes this impossible. The formal-democratic organizations were, as they still are, permeated to such an extent by authoritarian concepts and practices that they also could not provide a framework. Since political parties have an

authoritarian structure and live on human helplessness, nothing could be expected of them. Thus one was confronted by a big void when one asked oneself what social organization would help the insights of sex-economy and its clear-cut social consequences to come through. This void paralyzed every practical step for a number of years.

However, during these years, an answer gradually and spontaneously formulated itself: *natural work democracy.* Gradually, I came to recognize its existence and mode of functioning. It was easy to see how, again and again, it ran into conflicts with formal-democratic and authoritarian principles. It is now five years since I began to understand its functioning; I still do not know where these observations will lead. To return to the organization of the Orgone Institute:

My attention was called to the work-democratic functioning of society when the reproach was made, in 1938, that I did not give sufficient directions to the members of the organization. In 1939, I was able to answer to this that *every worker must find and secure his own place within the framework of our work methods.* I did not feel like being a "President." I cannot tell the director of a school how to bring up his children, or a director of a birth control clinic how to run it, or the chief of a psychiatric clinic how to treat his patients. In addition, everyone has his own peculiarities in carrying out his work functions, peculiarities which may be at variance with my own or those of others. Nevertheless, our Institute kept together and grew steadily, even though slowly.

On what principle, then, was our organization based, if there were no votes, no directives and commands, no secretaries, presidents, vice presidents, etc.?

What kept us together was our WORK, *our mutual interdependencies in this work, our factual interest in one gigantic problem with its many specialistic ramifications.* I had not solicited co-workers. They had come of themselves. They remained, or they left when the work no longer held them. We had not formed a political group or worked out a program of action. It was the demands of the many-sided work and the necessity of solving social, professional and personal problems which, in January 1936, made us form the *Institut für sexualökonomische Lebensforschung.* We had no other than professional meetings. Each one made his contribution according to his interest in the work. One physician raised money because he wanted to see my laboratory grow and wanted to work in it himself. Others translated sex-economic writings and published a journal in their

own language, without my having suggested it, simply because the work required it. Roger du Teil organized bion research in France because he felt it was his duty as a natural scientist, not because I persuaded him. Neill came because he needed vegetotherapy in the work with his pupils; I, on the other hand, needed his school because it confirmed my concepts of self-regulation by its splendid functioning.

My dependence on the microscope and the thermometer, or the dependence of orgone research on research in electricity and light done by other scientific workers is a *historical work dependence*. In this dependence there is no room for political ideologies. It is the *workers* of all professions and not the Machiavellis who, during the past centuries, have established the historical soil for my work. Just as political ideology cannot do work, so it cannot grasp the work-democratic functioning in social life. Workers criticize results and methods, they learn, and help *to do things better;* they do not call each other "traitor," "spy," "renegade," etc.; they do not shoot each other as the political gangsters do. They do not force anybody to do *their* work, as the politicians force others, at the point of the knife or machine gun, to die for *their* ideas.

My assistants in the bion laboratory came to me because they were interested in *the work*. The one remained for years, because he applied his interest *practically*. The other only wished to be an employee without a responsible interest in the work, or he wanted to become "famous" without practical achievement, and soon dropped out, *automatically*.

One physician returned to his country and spontaneously began to build up a sex-economic nursery. Subsequently, I learned as much from his experiences as he had previously learned from mine. I had not directed him to start this undertaking, I had not even suggested it. He had children himself. Their development, together with his professional interest, gave him the idea of a sex-economic study of infants.

There are, then, objective biological work interests and work functions capable of regulating human cooperation. Exemplary work organizes its forms of functioning organically and spontaneously, even though only gradually, gropingly and often making mistakes. In contradistinction, the political organizations, with their "campaigns" and "platforms," proceed without any connection with the tasks and problems of daily life.

A group of socialists in Holland, whom I did not know personally, published works on political psychology and soon had many followers in various cities. But since they operated partly on the basis of party-political

principles there soon were quarrels, ideology formations and empty, formal organization politics, and the movement disintegrated. So much about the international circle.

There were also the connections with more remote branches of work. For example, the bion research required special kinds of apparatus. An instrument firm in Vienna built these according to my specifications. Without the work of this firm, I could not have proceeded. On the other hand, the firm also gained from the contact with my laboratorium. For example, I demonstrated to the representative of the firm the technique of microphotography at magnifications of over 2000x, something which at that time was a great novelty. If the war had not interrupted this connection, this work connection would have become very fruitful. What right, one must ask, has a political good-for-nothing *to destroy* such achievements? Why are there no laws against such social crimes? Why can a whole world of industrious people be hindered in their work, their lives, and their international intercourse by a handful of parasites?

The following illustration may show how political procedure is at variance with factual work. In the old Sexpol, it was customary to "discuss" scientific questions in the manner of formal-democratic party organizations. I remember a meeting early in 1936, after the discovery of the bions, in which I stimulated a discussion among politically oriented people. I showed a bion film and explained the principle. In the discussion, all kinds of opinions, objections and doubts were expressed, all without any factual basis. From this I learned the following fact: *Factual processes cannot be discussed unless the participants themselves do practical work and have practical experience.* In Germany and Austria, party politicians customarily voted on birth control, social medicine, methods of bringing up children, etc. What nonsense! How can a general or trade union official determine what measures in social medicine are good or bad? How can a party secretary know the requirements of a mental hygiene organization? But in Germany and Austria this kind of work depended on the mentality of a party secretary, and of a neurotic one to boot. The practical result was left to chance: whether this or that official was a humanly open or an ascetic character. This fact alone has wreaked untold damage in many social realms.

Only my trained and practically active assistants can, together with me, determine the tasks of orgone research. Only Neill's pupils and teachers can, together with him, determine the fate of Summerhill School, not I,

or the Secretary of the Orgone Institute, or the manager of the Orgone Institute Press. As long as Neill's educational methods work factually in the direction of self-regulation, and as long as I, in the Orgone Institute, have factual contact with it, the *work-democratic* relationship functions. If Neill, tomorrow, should introduce authoritarian methods of punishment while I should continue to advocate self-regulation and the danger of corporeal punishment; or if I were to advocate the suppression of infantile sexuality while Neill should continue to adhere to self-regulation and sex-affirmation, cooperation would automatically cease. In order to separate from me, Neill would not need to agitate against me or to shoot me. The relationship would dissolve of itself, for there would no longer be a common interest and mutual furthering of functioning.

This is an incontrovertible fact: *If personal enmities, intrigues and political manoeuvres make their appearance in an organization, one can be sure that its members no longer have a factual meeting-ground in common, that they are no longer held together by a common work interest. And where there is no work interest, there is also no work-democratic principle. This is work-democratic self-regulation.* Just as organizational ties result from common work interests, so they dissolve when the work interests dissolve or begin to conflict with each other.

To take another example: Wolfe takes care of our Journal. Our interest in the Journal we have in common with other workers of the Institute. As long as Wolfe functions in his work, as long as I or others write articles in keeping with the demands of the work, the work-democratic relationship continues. True, there may be this or that difference of opinion, but *the function of the Journal takes precedence,* it alone determines the course of the work. There may be differences of opinion as to the size or the character of the publications, but all this remains in the framework of rational work interest. But if Wolfe were to do a poor editing or publishing job, if he used the Journal for personal instead of factual purposes; or if I were to do my scientific work not in the interest of research and of the development of the total work, if, say, I were to modify it in the interest of obtaining a Nobel prize, that is, would let irrational motives interfere with the work, then the work-democratic relationship would collapse, and the Journal with it. In brief, not votes, *not organization politics determine the function of an individual in the total work, but only and alone good or poor work function. Should one of my co-workers better master bion research, orgone therapy and sex-economic theory than I, I would relinquish my post of Director of the Orgone Institute to him.* I hope I shall never lose this point of view. The well-known struggle for preferred positions, honorary or political, cannot exist in a work democracy as long as the natural interlacing of the work-democratic functions continues without hindrance. If anyone were to assume the title of "Director" of this or that, without actually fulfilling the functions of a director, he would automatically drop out of the totality of the work, without anybody's agitating against him or deposing him by vote. He simply would be incapable of following and would soon develop the well-known reactions of the emotional plague.

If an individual has reasonable control over his irrationalism, if he has really *grown one with the work,* he will know *in time* when he is no longer able to do good work. He will then come and say, "I can no longer do it, somebody else better take over." This is possible without any intrigue, hatred or envy, but only if the *total* work is determined by work-democratic principles and not by votes without further obligations.

The fulfillment of practical work functions has an educational effect, provides rational guidance and excludes irrationalism to a far-reaching degree. In a formal-democratic organization, there are so and so many directors, vice directors, secretaries, and maybe hundreds of non-working members, while the secretary does all the work. This difference leads to the core of the educational and rational function of work democracy. Formal democracy, which works with votes without further obligation, has always tried to draw the members into the work, but with very little success. For a work interest cannot be taken over like a position, it must *grow organically.*

A working individual can take responsibility only for processes which he himself has chosen, which he himself takes loving care of, the growth of which means a piece of himself. *One cannot vote on work functions, one cannot "delegate" work.* This is inherent in *genuine* work. This principle of self-regulation, however, does not mean that the worker is not forced to learn certain techniques which make him "unfree" if he is to apply them usefully. A father is free to determine to have a child, but not to let it starve.

Let us apply this natural principle of work democracy to the social sphere: Clearly, human society cannot rest with the determination of life through the election of "representatives" of the working masses of people alone. Democracy is a process of development. Development, we must ask,

in what direction? Toward *ever fuller and more genuine forms of the determination of social existence by the masses of all working individuals themselves;* toward an ever-increasing practical participation of the working individuals in the guidance of production and consumption; toward increasing enjoyment of the goods of production by the working people corresponding to their increasing functioning responsibility. Is the principle of democracy valid, then? Yes, but the *genuine, full* democracy, in which the working masses *learn to govern their lives themselves, where they can learn to do so by practical experience.*

The following incident will illustrate the importance of practice in work democracy. It clearly shows how adherence to formalism interferes with democratic functioning, and the superiority of the work-democratic principle. After some training in sex-economy, a group of teachers planned the establishment of a nursery. They got together and, purely formalistically, elected a director, a secretary and a treasurer, and some "honorary members," one of whom was elected because he had promised to contribute money which, of course, is no *work* achievement. They rented and furnished a house and felt ready to receive children. But soon there were bad feelings, disagreements and the sure sign of failure: *irrational outbreaks.* The undertaking had come about spontaneously, without my suggesting it. But when things began to go wrong I did not want the people to get more deeply involved in the unfortunate situation and invited them to a discussion. The situation turned out to be the following: The teacher who had been *elected* "executive director" protested against the overburdening with work. The "vice director" did not want to do any practical work because she had a position in a public school. The secretary had other obligations, and the honorary president also could do nothing. A money contribution is no functioning work. An open discussion brought the irrational background into the open: The money contributor and the teacher who had no time had entered the undertaking with the secret intention of finding a place for their own child. Another teacher admitted that she did not feel up to the task, and a third admitted frankly that she was afraid of the word "sex-economy."

In brief, the whole thing was a classical example of a purely formalistic organization with all kinds of hidden motives which had nothing whatsoever to do with the concrete work function of a nursery. Since all the participants had undergone a character restructuring, the clarification of the situation was not difficult. In spite of the investment already made, it

was decided to give up the plan and to wait for a better occasion. It became clear that the plan had originated from the feeling "we've got to do something" and had not organically grown out of work needs. A year later, all the participants, with one exception, had found their own concrete field of work within the sex-economic framework. All remained good friends; not only one nursery, but several branches of the work developed organically; there are no intrigues and irrationalism. Thus, the principle of the organic development of work interests won out over a formalistic failure.

Such experiences are *new and important.* We are only in the process of collecting them and learning from them. No doubt, there is a natural work-democratic process, functioning everywhere, even though disturbed and disrupted by formalism and irrationalism. There is no doubt that *wherever collective work functions well, the work is based not on the formal-democratic but on the work-democratic principle.*

Our Institute has not developed a "work-democratic ideology" or founded a "work-democratic party." It functions according to voluntary principles of work and interests. But it also does not suffer political ideologies to interfere with the concrete work process. Our way of looking at things derives from the everyday work tasks, from the difficulties which have to be mastered and the prospects which the work provides. It is the work function and not personal interest which makes people come, and the neglect of the work function which eliminates them automatically. Since the work-democratic principle of organization has been followed consciously and attentively, personal frictions have ceased; there is no personal disloyalty, but only failure in the work, no *personal* loyalty, but *identification with the work.*

Is this kind of organization "anarchistic"? Not in the least. It is governed by the *interest in the work process.* Is it a "cooperative"? One might call it that. At any rate, the conscious organization of this natural principle is new and interesting; it applies to all branches of work; it is in harmony with the interest in free activity and with self-regulation, and at the same time disciplined, orderly and fruitful. I can no longer think of working in any other form. Am I the "Director" of all these independent work functions? Nonsense. I direct only my own field of work which I have created myself. In the same way, any co-worker directs his own field, with his own responsibility which, *if fulfilled,* is at the same time a *responsibility for the total work.* I learn from them, they from me, and each from

everybody else. Even though my scientific and medical research work, over decades, has provided me with more experience and knowledge, each independent and cooperating co-worker brings *his* own experiences and peculiarities. Irrationalism enters also, it is true; but the irrationalism dwindles before the tremendous interest in *practical achievement.* It does not take the whole stage as it does in formalistic life. *This is new,* extremely gratifying and hopeful. We all know that we need each other, learn from each other and that we are united by *the common work on the living function in all its manifold aspects.*

I believe that the practical answer to social irrationalism has been found. To what extent is this insight applicable? Does it also apply to, say, an industrial concern with some 50,000 workers, if it applies to our scientific organization with a score of professional workers? Probably it does. What we know for certain is that the work-democratic functions govern *every* work process and total society, otherwise humanity would have perished long ago.

Once the work-democratic principle is recognized as opposed to the irrationalism which human structure introduces into work, the framework is given in which to proceed. The disturbing effect of irrationalism makes itself felt in different ways in different work organizations: in industry, in the form of ruthless profit interest on the part of management or as lack of interest in the product on the part of the workers; in established scientific organizations in the form of the craving for power on the part of the officials which paralyzes the progressive endeavors of scientific youth; in the form of formalism instead of objective endeavor, of mechanistic rigidity of research or of irresponsibility of students.

Since work on the biopathies, in other words, on the *irrational* formation of human life is our field, we meet social and individual irrationalism in an accentuated form. The destructive influence of the emotional plague is to some extent prevented by the alteration of character which is required of every co-worker. This alteration of character, however, is not sufficient to make the usual individual into a responsible professional worker in orgone biophysics. Once an individual has attained mastery over his emotional plague reactions, he still has to learn, over a period of years, to *apply* it in everyday life. In the human intercourse with friend and enemy he must acquire the ability to function, without friction, in a work-democratic manner.

"Freedom" can be interpreted in two ways:

One wants to be free, that is, to be able to do or not do what one likes, without being bound by work processes. This is the chaotic form of the idea of freedom, the freedom idea of the repressed, inwardly unfree rebel. This kind of freedom cannot result in any lasting achievement, for lasting achievement requires adaptation to the rules of the work process.

Or one wants to be free, to be able to do or not do what one likes, *in order to achieve a definite aim of one's own choosing; in order to achieve a task which spontaneously grew and matured in one;* in order to fight against the evils which cause human misery. One chooses freely the goal, the work, the evil one wants to fight. But once this choice is made, one is no longer free to do or not to do what one pleases. One has given oneself over voluntarily to a process, and after that one depends on the laws and the peculiarities of this process. One still is free to stick to the task or to give it up. If the latter, one has at the same time annulled one's first free decision; if one contradicted oneself, the choice of the task was not really free, the work was chosen without a sound basis, accidentally or lightly.

The second type is *responsible freedom,* in contradistinction to the chaotic freedom ideology of the truly unfree individual which has no anchoring in biological or social processes.

An animal is free to take its food or to build its nest where it pleases. But it is not free, in the biological sense, to take poisonous food or to build its nest in such a fashion that it does not fulfill its purpose. The freedom of natural choice, then, is even biologically limited by the interests of life preservation.

This applies also to the *social freedom* the working masses of people must strive for: One is free to associate with whomever one wishes, and one is free to dissolve self-chosen associations whenever one wishes. If the dissolution of an association does not have a life-affirming or even has a destructive result, one acts in a life-inimical and, therefore, irrational, that is, *unfree* manner.

In a society which deserves to be called "free," everybody is free to choose his profession. But once the choice is made, one *secures* one's freedom by following the rules dictated by the particular work process. A construction worker is not free to build scaffolds so that he or his fellow workers will fall off; a railroad worker is not free to set switches as he pleases; a physician is not free to prescribe poisons which kill his patients or to start an appendectomy with an incision in the chest; a teacher is not free to educate his pupils to suicide; an aviator has to observe the strictest

technical rules if he is not to crash. In brief: Any kind of *life-affirmative* activity should be socially free; on the other hand, any *life-negating* activity should not be given the right to exist, for it is at variance with the biosocial basic function. Natural work democracy derives its rules of social administration from this biosocial antithesis.

The freedom ideology of the emotional plague wishes to deny all rules. Since this is nonsensical, practically speaking, it has done more harm to freedom than have the dictators. Again and again it is the chaotic "freedom" of the inwardly unfree, irresponsible rebel which nurtures the reactionary concept that freedom is not possible. The dictator, in order to justify his demands, keeps pointing to the danger of freedom. And it is correct that the misuse of freedom by neurotic people maintains human lack of freedom and threatens to make it perpetual.

In addition to the dilemma: serfdom or rebellion, there is a third kind of existence: *Full personal freedom together with faithful, objective and life-affirmative cooperation.*

We wish neither for serfdom nor for irrational rebellion. We want cooperation of independent, freely acting people who have enough inner freedom really to be free. We want the free initiative of the inventive worker and not that of the profiteer, the initiative of the free worker who knows what cooperation is and not the brazen initiative of the know-it-all. We want, in our field of work, the free initiative to start and guide work processes, and not the initiative to exploit human working power. We want the free initiative to production and construction, and not the "free initiative" to profiteer.

As long as human intellect is dulled by irrational concepts of life, freedom of commerce will take the form of imperialistic piracy, freedom of research the form of the dictatorship of obsolete and erroneous concepts, public opinion the form of a "public opinion" violated by the emotional plague.

Factual cooperation in the mutual interdependency of the work processes together with full personal freedom and objective initiative is the solution of the dangerous conflict between slavish rebellion and rebellious slavery. The life process of natural work democracy is the solution of the conflict between dictatorship and submissive irresponsibility. The rooting of all life processes in the cosmic law of nature is the solution of the destructive conflict between the mechanistic splitting up of human life and mysticism.

This is the dilemma of our times: The incapacity for freedom of the people who have been enslaved for thousands of years "justifies" the authoritarian management of the life process. The elimination of the human incapacity for freedom is *the* prerequisite for the elimination of dictatorship in all its forms. This is what the struggles of our century are really about. It is only necessary to penetrate, through the political noise of everyday, to the core of the problem. The fear of the free initiative of the masses of people is based on the fear of the "chaotic conditions" through which human society must pass before it can find a new basis in free human character structures. We are living in the midst of this chaos. This fear is the reason why today's writer, physician, teacher, administrator and labor leader talks about everything on earth except *one* thing: *The characterological enslavement of the masses who are beginning to fight for their rights, is not mentioned.* Since it is not mentioned, it is not given any thought, and for this reason the factual and organizational means cannot be found which would make the transition from characterological serfdom to genuine inner freedom as the basis of genuine social freedom less dangerous. One calls for the social revolution or one tries to prevent it, and forgets that we have been living in the midst of a revolution for decades.

This social framework includes the work of the Orgone Institute. We have formulated the central problem of our times, and constantly work on it as physicians, teachers and scientific workers. If we are to stick to it and are to do our best, practically, there can be no room in our organization either for authoritarian dictatorship or for rebellion against all responsibility. The double social dependency of all work processes shows itself here in a simple manner:

On the one hand, we depend on the work process which we have voluntarily made the content of our lives. According to this dependency, genuine free initiative and independence is the only possibility. On the other hand, we are also dependent on the human structure incapable of freedom which all have acquired in their upbringing. No real work of any kind can be done with either submissive or with rebellious individuals; this is inherent in the work process itself. It is particularly inherent in *our* work, for its goal is the study and mastery of "human nature," the freeing of the rational biological core and the overcoming of the emotional plague. It has its rational basis in the rational overcoming of intolerable, destructive conditions and modes of living. By constantly watching and

controlling our own irrationalism, wherever it appears, we safeguard our work. In concrete terms, this means the following: An organization of our work after the pattern of political parties or the customary formal organizations would inevitably destroy the work. We cannot operate with the *faith* in an "idea"; nor can we consider as members people who merely pay membership dues. We cannot expose ourselves to all the irrational influences which are customarily exerted by apprehensive or ambitious wives, by compulsively religious parents or by friends who have to watch conflicting interests. It is vitally necessary to let the work process itself decide the course and not let it be disturbed by irrational influences.

The individual work groups of our Institute have their freedom in the *work-democratic* sense, and not in the sense of the usual formal organizations. Each one can arrange his work as he thinks best. This applies, of course, to me in my personal field of work also. Since I have elaborated orgone biophysics, have for the longest time, by far, gathered observations, and also have made the greatest sacrifices (financially, familially, personally, in exertion), I also have the freedom to determine what work belongs to our field and what does not. It is necessary to point out what really seems matter of course: My position in the total work has developed as the result of my achievement in work. My opinion has a greater factual weight than that of other workers. This is often mistaken for "dictatorship." It is part of social irrationalism to claim for oneself all freedom of expression without granting it to the other fellow if he has a greater influence. I am safeguarded against misuse of this influence by the fact that the fight against social irrationalism forces me not to act grossly irrationally. And where I act rationally, my influence *should* make itself felt, in the interest of our goal.

In view of the emotional plague in all of us, the irrationalism of many co-workers, the social conditions and the enormous tasks, my position in the work demands more from my close co-workers than is customary. In a richly endowed scientific institute not burdened by pioneer work, it may make no difference if a student or assistant misuses his freedom, if he is rash in his criticism, personally ambitious, impractical or unreliable. One overlooks it, or his fate is unimportant. In our field of work, such behavior would be catastrophic. Experimental orgone research requires strict methodological training and work discipline. The worker must give up, at an early time, his mechanistic thinking; he must get used to the functional way of looking at things; he must give up his *wrong* way of being "critical" and must learn the *productively* critical application of new facts.

Pioneer work is different from work in known fields where all work methods are established and only have to be applied. The method of energetic functionalism is young, revolutionary in many ways, and therefore often misunderstood and fought. If, ten years ago, I eliminated, unequivocally, the irrational theory of protozoal "air germs" for my laboratory, it is inadmissible that a newcomer, even before having become acquainted with bion research, enhances his self-confidence by "critically" propounding the air germ theory which he had—uncritically—learned. It is a sign of lack of freedom if one is incapable of learning something new and blocks one's way by the application of misunderstood and erroneous concepts, thereby, in addition, disrupting our routine work.

Is, then, the demand that the young student in our laboratory should begin by learning and by asking questions about new facts, "dictatorial"? Certainly not. Will a factory which builds engines according to well-established principles, allow an apprentice to be "critical" and to introduce methods which he has learned in the building of wheel-barrows? Or will an aviation school let a student, before he has learned to handle an airplane, apply his own "ideas" as to the handling of the controls, merely because he wants to show that he "is somebody," too? Such attitudes have nothing to do with freedom, but merely with the *incapacity to learn*.

The fact that my co-worker first has to learn *to help* me in my work, to be an assistant, is given by the specific tasks of orgone biophysics, and not thought up by me. He can decide to do it or not to do it. But once he has decided to help me, he must adjust to the work process guided by me. Once he has mastered it, once he has become *objectively independent*, grave mistakes in our work relationships are excluded by the fact that we both cooperate, with the *same* method, in the *same* work process. Then, the diverse influences of personal envy and ambition, of apprehensive wives and of the social circles of aunts lose their effect on our relationship. Only then is it free of disturbing influences which have nothing to do with our work.

Then, and only then, when my co-worker has comprehended the work process, when he has become one with it, has made it an inseparable part of his life, can there be free debates concerning new ways, goals, methods, results, etc. Then, he is an equal and I listen with profit to what he has to say. I learn from him and he from me. Then, and only then, is his

initiative and independence gratifying, because it is no longer the false self-assertion of the submissive rebel or of the fresh know-it-all.

What we do, then, is to educate independent, cooperating assistants and to eliminate the accidental passerby, the "critical kibitzer" and the freedom windbag incapable of thinking for himself. More than that, we oppose with the full weight of our factual authority any such misuses and misinterpretations of scientific freedom. As an assistant, the co-worker must help. As an individual, he is free to move about in our field as much as he pleases; the field is so gigantic that it certainly provides ample opportunity. But we cannot permit "criticism" out of inferiority feelings or opinions and attitudes which clearly derive from an envious striving for greater "fame" rather than from an interest in furthering the work.

It is customary to base scientific relationships on personal friendships. I followed this custom for many years, and I can only recommend giving it up. Few things are more labile than personal friendships. If work is based on it, it collapses when the friendship ceases. That does not mean that the combination of friendship and common work is not an ideal state of affairs; but it is rare. One cannot make an extensive work process dependent on a rarity. For this reason, I emphasize the work relationship over against the personal affiliations.

If the worker is to function, the work itself must have become an inseparable part of his life. Only when he no longer can live and work any differently is his functioning guaranteed. This is no different in our field of work from any other. As one cannot build Diesel motors according to the principles of steam engines, though both serve the same purpose of locomotion, one cannot, in our field, mix bion research with, say, genetic research. True, one can try to understand, from the point of view of bion research, what the geneticist means by "gene," just as the enlightened geneticist can view his genes from our point of view of the bionous nature of all living substance. But he who turns *against* bion research where it contradicts hereditarian mysticism, must contradict himself and must become irrational.

Our work, like any other, requires *concentration of interest*. We often meet the difficulty that newcomers to our field are incapable of separating themselves from other fields of work sufficiently to dedicate themselves fully to our work. These obstacles are never based on factual motives, but on such things as personal attachments to people in the old fields of work,

the fear of fully giving themselves over to our work, personal insecurity, etc.

Sex-economy grew in association with the theory of Freud and with the critical refutation of its mechanistic concept of culture. Orgone biophysics, on the other hand, grew *autonomously*. More than that: the sex-economic criticism of the psychoanalytic theory of culture would not have been possible if my work had not been guided from the beginning (in 1919) by the principle of functionalism, the principle which, 16 years later, led to the discovery of the cosmic orgone energy. My functional method had its roots in earlier studies of *perception*, that is, a phenomenon of consciousness. Their relationships to psychoanalysis are secondary. The central problem, that of plasma pulsation, is strictly at variance with the psychoanalytic theory of the instincts. While it is correct to consider sex-economy an offspring of Freud's theory, it would be incorrect and misleading to deny the *originality of orgone biophysics*. Orgone biophysics cannot be regarded an appendage of sex-economy and, with that, of psychoanalysis.

People who come to us from psychoanalysis tend to adhere to erroneous theories such as that of "cultural adaptation" or the theory of "sublimation." That is, of course, not admissible, for our criticism of culture derived precisely from the erroneousness of these concepts. One cannot expect a child to "sublimate" its genitality and at the same time bring it up sex-economically. These two things are mutually exclusive. If the former psychoanalyst cannot rid himself of these erroneous concepts, he will resort to irrational justifications in order to avoid having to take a clear stand, and will thus create difficulties.

A similar situation exists in the case of a teacher who wants to become a sex-economist and who retains his position in an authoritarian school. He should retain it; but he cannot combine the sex-negative attitude of his school with the sex-economic orientation of our Institute. If he is conscious of the conflict, he may limit himself to making observations in his school, refrain from active sex-economic education and wait until conditions make it possible for him to proceed successfully. If, on the other hand, he represses his fear of losing his position, he will proceed irrationally: he will either unwisely insist on applying his sex-economic knowledge and thus endanger himself uselessly, or he will burden us with useless compromises or even with irrational hatred.

A worker coming from a socialist organization will attempt to introduce socialist politics into orgone biophysics and orgone biophysics into socialist

politics. His attempts at compromise are irrational, for the socialists will not include the sex-economic principle in their program, and our work-democratic way of living is incompatible with the socialist principle of pitying and pampering the poor and weak. The socialist demands that "one" should "give" equality to, say, sanitation workers. The work democrat demands that the sanitation workers should themselves carry the responsibility for sanitation and should, with the protection of the law, fight themselves for their equality. For the time being, however, the sanitation workers only want better wages (rightly so), *but not the responsibility* for sanitation in their locality. I may emphasize the fact that our standpoint gives more to the sanitation worker, in the long run, than the party-political standpoint. But for the time being the workers prefer the tutelage of the government. It is easier to demand bread and freedom, *without* responsibility, from the government, than it is, on the basis of one's *indispensability*, to fight for one's responsibility, bread and freedom. We consider pitying the masses harmful and fruitless; only *burdening* the masses with responsibility opens up any future. This is something which the political ideologist does not understand; or he misunderstands it and becomes malicious towards us.

Religious people who come to sex-economy present a difficult problem. Religion and sex-economy can exist side by side in this world, although the church does not like us, and we don't like the mysticism of the church. Certainly, the clergyman might try to understand the place of biosexuality in religion; and religion is a field of study for orgone biophysics.

Here, as elsewhere, the law of *competition* is valid. *Who is better able to help people, miserable as they are, who can better free them from disease and better secure living functioning? That has to be shown in a practical way.* But one cannot believe that the souls are in heaven and simultaneously believe that the function of the soul ceases with the disintegration of the orgonotic system. One cannot, without becoming irrational, demand the asexuality of infants, considering sexuality as a deadly sin, and simultaneously bring up children in a manner which makes them capable of a natural love life.

Here, also, the *work* principle is decisive. A civil engineer may not be disturbed in his work by his belief in happiness in a hereafter; in a sex-economist, such a belief would be disastrous. As little as a clergyman would tolerate my using his pulpit for a talk on the disturbances of orgastic potency, so little would we engage a clergyman to give instruction in

religious sexual ethics. Broadminded people, however, may see the possibility of a common discussion of the interpretation of the life principle.

A similar situation exists with regard to *nationalism* and the *race problem*. One cannot be a nationalist and race-hater and at the same time develop correct scientific concepts concerning nationalism and the race problem. There is not only a German but also an English and a Jewish fascism. To us, education in the Prussian patriarchate is a mental-hygienic concern like the Jewish custom of sending small children to a Talmudic school and of torturing them with 12 hours of learning. Both forms of education belong equally to the emotional plague. The ruler which is broken over a child's knuckles is the same ruler whether it is used by a Jewish or a German chauvinist. Here, too, the work principle decides, and not the mentality. One cannot educate children nationalistically and at the same time educate them to self-regulation. Nationalism is excluded, not only because we are ideological opponents of race hatred, but, principally, because our work does not tolerate it if it is to function.

The reader will have realized that all this is a practical attempt to move the fight against the emotional plague from the realm of opinion to that of *practical work* for life. Hitlerism, in its black, red, yellow and white form can flourish only where it is opposed not by the principle of work for life, but solely by "other opinions" concerning life. Just as Hitlerism grew out of the "ideological differences of opinion," so it collapses when it is opposed by *practical work on the living function*. A socialist mayor versed in intrigue is, according to our definition, no less Hitlerist than a party Fascist. Hitler's name might well be preserved for posterity as the name and symbol for everything that is non-work, mysticism, intellectual darkness and emotional plague. The happy laugh of a child is infinitely more important than the whole social atmosphere from which Hitlerism grows.

There is the enormous social problem as to why thus far every social movement which started as being revolutionary became reactionary and put the brakes on social progress. No doubt, a main source of such degeneration is the infiltration of irrational interests into an originally rational movement. Primarily, it is the structural incapacity for freedom of the average armored individual which again and again brings all efforts to naught. As far as I know, we are the *first* organization possessing a piece of fundamental insight into the degeneration of social movements. We want to apply this insight practically, *in time:* that means, at a time

when everything is still in flux. Thanks to its natural functioning in the rational realm of life, work democracy presents a number of safeguards against a premature degeneration of our cause, perhaps against any degeneration. We should not miss this chance. The developing forms of the international organization of orgone biophysics should be kept as loose and fluid as possible. He who has become too secure in his function may easily become an inhibition to the coming generation. He who, on the other hand, depends in his function on work achievement, will retain his elasticity longer and will, therefore, better be able to evaluate the needs of the next generation. It is a matter of keeping one's footing between obsolete traditions and new, embryonic forms of living which are *as yet not* capable of functioning fully; taking over from tradition what is fruitful and to drop what, with continuing progress, has become sterile. It is a matter of giving new, unusual work functions a possibility of proving themselves and of existing. This requires much aliveness and elasticity; strict adherence to the basis of our philosophy of life, *self-regulation of the living function*, will be a secure guiding line.

It may be that this attempt at a work-democratic organization is premature or inept. It may collapse. I would prefer a collapse from imperfection to a collapse from rigidity and bureaucratization. In the latter case, the path forwards would be blocked, in the former our children could go back to embryonic forms of existence and bring about further development where we failed. It has always been our aim to put *facts* in the place of illusions.

In our endeavors, be they scientific, social or organizational, we always should keep the picture of *living nature* before us. It forms a functional unit subject to one basic law; and yet it is split up in millions of independent species. Every seed becomes the center of a new, complex functional unit. Every species is composed of bions, but the composition of these bions into forms is different, say, in the crystal and in the grass stalk, even though functionally identical; different in the deer and the hawk, and yet similar; different in the protozoon and the metazoon, and yet functionally identical in the living orgastic contractions. The better rooted in its plasmatic origin the more capable of functioning life is, no matter how complex its organization may have become.

Our scientific organization must remain as alive as the living function itself to the study and protection of which it is devoted. It would be a contradiction to force the living function into organizational forms which

were developed for the killing of life. If we act in accordance with the life functions we must trust in the *principle of self-regulation* in the question of organization also. The extent of irrationalism in our work groups will be the yardstick with which to measure the extent to which life research is in accord with its organizational form.

The most important task in this difficult process will be the furthering of any *genuinely* free life activity and the elimination of irrational freedom concepts. For, to repeat it once more: *the greatest danger to genuine human freedom is the erroneous concept of freedom produced by a human structure which is enslaved, inwardly and outwardly.*

Orgonon, Maine
August, 1944

ARMORED HUMAN BEINGS VERSUS THE HEALTHY CHILD

By Felicia Saxe

This article deals with the difficulties to which emotionally healthy children are exposed under the present conditions of our civilization. An attempt will be made to evaluate some experiences and discuss problems which were brought to my attention, partly by the children themselves, partly by parents and educators.

The children presented here comprise two different groups: one group is basically healthy and clashes with the outer world on account of its spontaneous behavior. These require assurance and support for a rational solution of their conflicts. The other group is in the process of being treated or has already been through orgone therapy. Because of their newly acquired healthy behavior and their natural attitude towards their sexual impulses, these children find themselves surrounded by hostility. Under these circumstances it is imperative that they be protected against the danger of sliding back into former neurotic behavior.

The parents and educators who have come for advice are, on the whole, people who agree with sex-economic principles. They have the desire to grant their children and wards that freedom which they themselves missed

in their childhood. They desire to protect them against becoming neurotics like themselves; therefore, they try to give them an unauthoritarian upbringing. Yet on account of their own fear of authoritarian society they lack the ability to stand up for their children's right to sexual and emotional freedom. There is a difference whether they came to the conviction of sex-economy being right by way of merely reading the literature, or by having been freed of neurosis through personal experience of orgone therapy. In the latter case, after shedding their neurotic traits, they have to reorientate themselves in the outside world. Only after conclusion of this important phase of their own development do they have a chance to aid those children successfully who are dealing with similar problems. What they all have in common is the inability to protect their children in an intelligent way from the blows of the outside world. They shrink from their own convictions as soon as the children's struggle begins. Guilt feelings for "exposing" their children develop into severe anxieties. The insecurity which results from this attitude has a very bad effect on the children's emotional life.

To master these problems, the sex-economically trained therapists, parents and educators must be fully aware of the fact that they are imposing a terrific struggle upon the children by allowing them to grow up biologically and emotionally healthy while these children are forced to live in a world of armored adults and playmates. They must be willing to accept the full responsibility for each and every difficulty arising from this yet unsolved social problem. Not only must they acquire the ability to guide their children intelligently through their emotional difficulties, but in moments of danger they must also fight side by side with them. Only if the children perceive that they are backed by adults, not alone in words but in "action," and that the adults, in doing so, risk being ostracized and destroyed by the superiority of society, only then will they assert their natural courage and strength. Their belief in being right will not be destroyed despite all effort of antisexual society to convince them of the truth of the opposite. The children in Neill's school live under fortunate exceptional conditions in a free world all their own which they only leave occasionally. By the time the school discharges them they are sufficiently mature and strong to defend themselves on an adolescent level. But the group of children in whom we are interested forms a generation of "pioneer children." They are confronted with the difficult task of remaining emotionally firm in a society which attempts to smother their life

impulses, while they are dependent upon the adults for their material support, as well as bodily care and enlightenment (*cf.* Wilhelm Reich: The Function of the Orgasm).

In order to acquire the inner security so badly needed for a successful guidance of children through the important years of character-formation and puberty, we must be frank with ourselves regarding our anxieties about their development. These will mostly revolve around the fact that we shall be able to improve the condition of the world only when we succeed in raising a generation of healthy children who, as adults, will some day form the corner-stones of a better world order. This involves the difficulty that they are to spend their childhood in a world not yet sufficiently prepared for the acceptance of their healthy behavior, in spite of the influence which sex-economy has exerted on such important groups as parents, educators, physicians and clergymen. Consequently, we enforce suffering upon the children who are being brought up in an unauthoritarian way. We drag them into a fight which, in our opinion, represents the only chance of happiness for them, as well as for mankind in general. However, we cannot predict whether they will fulfill our hopes of their emerging from this struggle as free and happy human beings, or whether their young personalities will be broken. We might deprive them of the fruits of this very struggle, because we are forced to plunge them into it at such a tender age that they are unable to decide for themselves whether they are strong enough to accept it. These facts involve a tremendous responsibility towards our children. It will be far easier for us to carry this burden if we become fully aware of the children's disastrous situation. It leaves them but two choices of development: either to become sexually unhealthy, submissive neurotics who later on will become a mass of helpless victims in World War III, or to grow up as sexually healthy, free human beings with an unblurred intelligence which they may use in a constructive way for a peaceful solution of world problems. Since they are too young to make the decision for themselves, we must shoulder the responsibility of making it for them. If we choose the first alternative we have to prepare them for the role of helpless victims, by giving them an antisexual and authoritarian upbringing, the technique of which has unfortunately been highly developed during the course of the last centuries. Thus, we would not have much trouble in destroying their life energies at an early age. If we choose the second solution, we face the sad fact that a struggle of life and death with the armored world awaits them.

It is our duty to do everything possible to strengthen them biophysically and emotionally to such an extent that they won't just manage to survive, but will retain their unimpaired sexual and emotional health.

The degree to which this can be accomplished depends on our ability to safeguard the children. Our technical skill in handling difficult situations in the children's life will grow proportionally with our belief in the strength of normally functioning biophysical energies in a healthy child, in contrast to the pseudostrength of its distorted manifestations in the form of secondary drives on the part of the outer world. We must not underestimate the danger of these secondary drives, because it is important to take the proper steps to protect the children actively against them, but we must by no means fear them.

The following examples might shed light upon typical difficulties into which children who are healthy, or on the way to acquire health, will run in one form or another. They are chosen and presented with the aim of sharpening therapists', parents' and educators' alertness to recognize and understand critical situations during which the child needs support. Frequently children cannot express this need. It is characteristic of a traumatic situation in a child's emotional life that his orgonotic contact with the person of his confidence is interrupted. Because of this disturbance of orgonotic pulsation he is unable to reach out for help as he would normally do when danger arises. We must learn to diagnose this condition immediately and *reach out for him*, offering warmth, understanding, and love. We must discuss his problem honestly with him and, what is more important, explain to him the existence of irrational behavior and its tricky results on the part of the outside world, simultaneously supporting him with practical help. Gradually we will develop an ever-increasing understanding of the circumstances which are apt to bring about dangerous situations. We will learn to counteract their ill effect on the child's biological functioning prophylactically by releasing his sense of isolation and insecurity through intense loving contact with him.

LARRY

When Larry was brought to me for therapy at the age of three and a half, he was a very neurotic child. He was cranky, his behavior oscillated between helpless resignation and violent destructiveness. He cried a great deal, wet his bed frequently, and did not fall asleep at night until he succeeded in persuading his mother to take him into her bed and cuddle him for a long time. Then he would find a few hours' rest in his own bed, but would get up before dawn and continue his demands. He seemed to find a sadistic pleasure in waking her up continuously, which resulted in such nervousness on her part that she could find no rest at night. He had frequent head colds, often accompanied by high temperatures. Even when not suffering from an acute cold, his breathing was constantly accompanied by loud sniffling. His shoulders and chest were pulled up, his head bent to the side, there was a blurred look in his eyes, which he kept either slightly closed or—in states of anxiety—widely open with an empty stare. It was obvious that most of the time he was thrown from a state of anxiety into one of agonizing sadness, from both of which he tried to escape by making constant demands on his mother for gifts and all sorts of treats. His mother had never been able to give him genuine love. She was familiar with sex-economic theories and, therefore, knew that the cause of her child's sickness was her complete lack of orgonotic contact with him. She suffered from guilt feelings because of her inner coldness, which she covered up with an artificial, false behavior towards Larry. She tried unsuccessfully to escape her guilt feelings by giving in to his irrational demands. Therefore, she granted him favors for which he asked, such as doing absurd things at inconvenient times, or substituting for love the things which can be bought for money. Invariably she became furious on such occasions, but tried to suppress her rage.

On relating these facts to me her voice became shrill, suddenly changing into whining, just like the child's demanding voice. It seemed to me that the shrill voice was an expression of her vindictive feelings towards Larry; she tried to keep these under control by means of adopting the role of an understanding co-sufferer, underlining this role by use of the whining voice. There existed between mother and child a tense atmosphere of calm before the storm.

The mother told me that she had wanted a child immediately after the start of an unhappy marriage. She had married a man she did not love, in a neurotic attempt to break away from a previous frustrated love relationship. In this fatal situation she had recognized her strong desire for a child as a desperate attempt to solve her problem in an irrational way. Nevertheless she believed, in a compulsive way, that once a child were born "everything would be all right." Why she believed this she had never been able to explain. It had satisfied her to cling to this belief and

she did experience something like pseudohappiness during her pregnancy. Her illusion lasted until the child was born. Immediately after his birth she discovered his resemblance to his father. From this moment on she hated the child. She told me that the baby felt her hatred immediately at his first contact with her breast. His sucking had started with strong rhythmical pulls, while his face showed an expression of pleasurable expectation. But just as soon as he felt the hateful stiffness in his mother's body and was exposed to the piercing look in her eyes, the intervals between the pulls became irregular. The quality of the pulls changed from weak resignation to desperate, anxious wildness. There appeared a hopeless and disgusted expression on his face. *This structural change during the first nursing period became the decisive factor in his entire development,* which had already reached a peak of unhappiness at the age of three, as described above.

The mother told me that she had derived a sadistic pleasure from seeing the baby's disappointment. Therefore, she felt a deep urge to increase her hatred voluntarily and to let the baby feel it. She followed this urge uninhibitedly in spite of her guilt feelings about her behavior. During her first interview with me she reported these facts in a strikingly cold manner which was suddenly interrupted by outbursts of sobbing. I noticed a strange, alarming quality of screaming in the sounds of her sobs. It was accompanied by wild, yet sustained rolling of the eyes, while the forehead was terribly strained. For several seconds this tension of the forehead relaxed, then the eyeballs seemed almost to pop out of her head, as if a valve had opened. I was reminded of a dynamite explosion under a rocky surface, the intensity of which one cannot judge by its sound, but feels that it might tear the ground open at any minute and destroy everything in its environment.

This impression determined my therapeutic plan to work at high speed towards *two goals:* not only to cure Larry's neurosis, but at the same time make him strong enough to fight the danger which lurked in the personality of his unfortunate mother. There was an element of danger in her sadistic disposition which I foresaw would become more and more acute the healthier Larry was to become. Her destructive impulses had started out with such intensity that the only reason for their relative restriction up to now, I feared, was Larry's capacity to become a victim, which satisfied her sadism. Once he were healthy and were to lose this capacity, I was convinced that the mother's destructive rage would have dangerous

results for him. The course of Larry's treatment will demonstrate how important it is to include these considerations from the very outset in the therapeutic plan, and to take immediate active countermeasures by fortifying the child's capacity to defend himself. It is necessary to train him to recognize the sources of his danger, no matter how painful and disappointing this may be to him. He must be taught to fight for himself in a healthy way. If, at moments, he feels too weak and small, he must know how to make himself temporarily inconspicuous and unirritating to the person who represents danger for him. He must learn to experience fear instead of anxiety when he is endangered. Fear will stimulate his intelligence above his age level and help him to fight danger, whereas anxiety will block it and paralyze him. If one fails in this decisive measure, one might be able to cure a child's neurosis, but by the very fact of his cure endanger his life.

Larry's mother had a great deal of insight into her emotions and into the motives of her actions towards Larry because she had been in vegetotherapeutic treatment. Her treatment, which interests us only in so far as her relations with Larry are concerned, had been very successful, especially considering the severity of her neurosis, but it had limitations because of a peculiar disturbance of orgone pulsation, which was inaccessible. She had a touching, sincere desire to safeguard the child against her own destructiveness and, for this reason, wanted the child to be treated. I came to the conclusion that her feelings toward him could not be termed "ambivalent." They were fundamentally hateful and destructive. She could not feel any love for him but had a sad, longing desire to *become able* to love him some day. This desire was so strong that—with the most helpless expression—she rejected my repeated requests for a separation from Larry, in order that he might grow up in a free school, saying: "If I were to do this, I feel I would crack up. I still want a chance to love him some day when I might open up." I believe even now that she is right. Her cracking up had to be avoided not alone for her own, but for Larry's sake as well.

It was winter when Larry first came for treatment. He wore a heavy snowsuit and boots, yet resisted every attempt to take his clothes off. He planted himself in the middle of the room and gave me a desperate look when I talked to him, as if to say: "Don't bother with me, my opinion about people is set!" On condition that he was allowed to keep on his heavy clothing, which evidently gave him the feeling of a protective wall

between us, he finally consented to climb on my lap. A minute later he made the eternal gesture of a child who is craving love and human warmth —his head sank quietly on my shoulder. Then he sighed deeply. I respected his desire for silence and held him tightly in my arms. Then I rocked him for about twenty minutes while I sang soothingly to him. His head became more and more relaxed and the "snowsuit wall" melted away. He seemed to enjoy my wordless approach and allowed me to touch his tense muscles, tense all over his body. Gradually I began breaking the tension in his leg muscles. He responded with loud screams. Only then did I break the silence, explaining that I knew this was a painful procedure, but I also knew that he must feel very sad because this tension and his sadness were one and the same thing, and that I did this only because I wanted to help him to get rid of both, and wanted him to become happy. He yelled: "I don't want you to!," yet he gave in as all neurotic children have done without exception when my therapeutic actions followed to the letter Reich's theory that the *psychological disturbance is identical with the self-perception of the distortion of the biological functioning.*

It goes without saying that we must be led by this biophysical concept in every orgone-therapeutic treatment, as Reich has stated. In the treatment of adults and adolescents the predominance of the psychological work or the work on the muscular armor may vary according to the individual structure of the neurosis during the different phases of the treatment. However, in the treatment of small children it seems imperative to avoid any psychological approach at the beginning of the treatment, with one exception only: to give the child the explanation that the purpose of the treatment is to help him to become happy. According to Reich's concept of the *biological functioning of pleasure* I think of a child's early psychological development as a constantly flowing process of self-perceptions, the nature of which is determined by the pleasure-gratifying or the pleasure-destroying quality of persons or objects in the outside world. If, at his entrance into the world, he is met with love and warmth, properly taken care of, and finds gratification of his biological needs, his self-perceptions will gradually teach him, through experience, to distinguish the characteristics of persons and objects who communicate pleasure or unpleasure. If, however, he meets frustration and interference with his biological needs on an early level of his development, as in the case of Larry, then the child's capacity for experiencing pleasure becomes disturbed. If the shock is as strong as Larry's first nursing experience—and

there is no neurotic child without an early trauma of similar strength—the child's orgonotic pulsation becomes impeded to such an extent that, even though pleasure were offered to him, he could no longer experience it. Consequently, his psychological development will be deprived of pleasurable self-perceptions and he will gain dim and distorted impressions of *any* experience. In this way he misses his chance to evaluate his inner perceptions properly in their relation to the outside world and is constantly misled. If we tried to approach him psychologically under these circumstances, our endeavors would be no less doomed to failure than an attempt to discuss color shades with a blind person.

The difference between the condition of a neurotic child and a neurotic adult lies in the fact that the child does not yet have enough experience to find out that something is wrong with him, while the adult who comes for treatment has this knowledge to a certain extent, else he would not seek help. The child is in the flowing process of finding out about the world in which he lives, whereas the adult has terminated this phase of his development and, therefore, has a chance to compare his subjective reactions with those of others. The neurotic child, in his process of learning about life, has nothing to register but unpleasurable experiences, and so the impression will dominate him that life is unpleasurable and sad. Under the conditions of our authoritarian society and its resulting educational system, there is very little chance to meet persons or playmates who will shake him into awareness of his subjective perceptions. So he will continue to project them into the outside world which, in severe cases, may lead to mental disturbances. One of the saddest experiences in this respect was the exclamation of a young man, 20 years of age, who had come for treatment in a state of deep, suicidal depression: "Please tell me how one is supposed to be if one is happy. I don't know how to do it, because I was never taught how!" He came from a bigoted, authoritarian home where every word represented a conventional lie. At the beginning of his treatment, whenever I broke some muscular tension, the repressed emotion could only break through after an endless compulsory repetition of the words: "Children should be seen, not heard!"

One should not be misled by the fact that even neurotic children often have happy experiences and do reach out for love. These emotions are always lacking in normal intensity and can only be experienced under exceptionally favorable conditions within the framework of the child's protective armor.

But now let us go back to Larry. For a few sessions I had to release his tension in the muscles of the thighs, buttocks, abdomen, and nape, by means of breaking them, because he refused most violently to carry out any lively, active movement. These manipulations resulted in outbursts of great anxiety and rage, which were followed by greedy thumbsucking. During the thumbsucking he became very restless and changed his position constantly. He lay on his back on my lap, rolled from one side to the other, curled up like a newborn baby, got on his knees and rested his head on my shoulder, and so forth. He did not allow me to place him on the couch, and showed a great desire for contact with a human body. He pushed me from one position into another, always trying to get more comfort and pleasure by adjusting himself to the change of my position. While he did this he looked at me one day as if wanting to say: "Even you are a dope. Help me faster, I want pleasure and I want it soon!" So I told him that he couldn't enjoy his thumbsucking as long as he hardly breathed. I pushed his chest gently, which made him furious. He sniffled loudly, literally sucked in his abdomen and swung his pelvis back. Now I worked fast, breaking the tension of the small of the back and nape, pressing his chest in, and bending his body into a circular line so that his knees approached the head. Then I hung him with a firm grip over my left, arm, grasping his knees with my right hand, and swung him a few times very fast around my sustaining arm. After loosening him up in this contracted position I stretched his entire body, sustaining him under his head and ankles, in order to help the liberated energy to expand more easily. Then I placed him on the couch. During the turns in the air he screamed terribly, but as soon as he lay on the couch he seemed to feel relief in the tension of the throat and stopped screaming, gasped for air, screamed again, got more air, and repeated the procedure. Finally he screamed with a relatively free voice *while* breathing and not *after* breathing. From then on he seemed to feel strong and changed his behavior completely. He told me that he hated me and would pretty soon kill me. He jumped on my lap like a wild cat and banged his head against my chest. He indicated that this very moment he had decided to fight, bit my finger and slapped my face when I withdrew my hand. I quickly supplied him with a large piece of linen and let him bite on this, but instead he tore it into shreds. Then he proceeded to smash the furniture. First he threw the toys from the shelf onto the floor with a sweeping gesture, then blocks against the windowpane, feeling greatly disappointed at not breaking it, and finally he knocked over chairs and tables. After this he was exhausted. Therefore, I picked him up, placed him on the couch, and let him kick his legs. He did this with great pleasure, bounced up and down, saying he felt fine. He played with some scattered toys and gladly followed my suggestion to run, jump, and swing around while playing airplane. From now on I treated him in the spacious room of my studio, instead of the small and intimate nursery which I use as long as a child suffers too much from fear of expansion.

A few days later, during his treatment, Larry said he wanted to make weewee and looked lovingly and sadly at my hand. I felt what he wanted. Accordingly I cupped my hand, saying: "All right, do it into my hand!" whereupon he hit me and said: "No." I told him that he did not need to become mad because of his desire. I told him that I knew just as well as he did that one does not usually make weewee into another person's hand, but that the look in his eyes had told me that he felt love for me and wanted to give me something that belonged to him, and that this giving had just come in the form of weewee. I had not yet finished my sentence when he let some drops fall most carefully into my cupped hand. Then he went to the bathroom, came running back and hugged and kissed me; he breathed freely for the first time without sniffling. His pelvis was relaxed, his head seemed to have grown out of his shoulders because he ceased to pull them up.

This was the turning point in Larry's life. He had given love and it had been accepted. A few days later a report from his nursery school came saying that Larry had become a well-adjusted child. From now on the sessions were divided into periods during which Larry released incredible amounts of destructiveness in free movement, alternating with periods of pleasurable thumbsucking while relaxing in my arms.

In connection with our subject, the techniques applied for the release of his emotions are of minor interest. It is only important that I prolonged his destructive period consciously, and carefully avoided letting him steam off too much rage at one time. I used up his rage economically for the purpose of stimulating his fighting impulses, having constantly the aim in mind of strengthening him against his mother's impulses. I tried to give him a feeling of strength, and the belief that he could challenge an adult. I did this by leading his destructive impulses gradually into fighting games, letting him feel the superiority of a victor. I fostered the "wildcat" in him, and influenced his character-formation purposely towards the

acquisition of vitality, quickness of reaction, and decision, courage and capacity for unsentimental self-defense. The more his capacity for giving love increased as a result of the treatment, the more did these character traits take the place of his previous neurotic destructiveness. Simultaneously, he outgrew his former tendency of temporary resignation.

His mother had meanwhile shown definite signs of unconscious desires to shake him off. She asked me repeatedly to give him love because he needed it, and she felt unable to provide him with it. She showed a tendency to use me as a mother substitute for her child. The healthier he grew, the more impatient she became, although she enjoyed his improvement intellectually.

Larry had a peculiar compulsive way of repeating the word "Hey" whenever he was mad, and also on many other occasions, when it made no sense. Sometimes the word was in complete contradiction to his loving facial expression. One day, when he used the word in rage because I did not build blocks to suit him, he yelled "Hey" to me. I told him we were not on "hey" terms any more. He looked at me perplexedly, flung his arms around me, licked my face and cried. He then ran to get some chewing gum, chewed it hurriedly, forced my lips apart with his hands, spat the gum into my mouth, sucked it out, and repeated this performance. Again, as in the case of his urinating, I threw my hygienic principles overboard and let him enjoy this belated gratification of his sucking impulses. Here was the second turning point on his way to health. The word "hey" was the expression of his psychological perception of his biological frustration. When I attacked it I did not have to "analyze" it any more, for by that time he functioned biologically so well that he knew the meaning himself. It was an utterance of anxiety, the roots of which reached back to his loveless infancy, during which he had experienced fear of death. Later on it developed into the emotional Leitmotiv of his being: "If I want to survive, I must fight!"

Immediately upon the gratification of his sucking impulses with the chewing gum he said, without transition: "Mummy is a stinker!" *Only now* had the time come to touch *calmly* upon the mummy situation and to explain that unfortunately his mother was not able to give him the kind of love he desired. I told him that it was not her fault, but that she suffered severely by her inability to love him. However, I hoped she would improve some day. I warned him that his mother might have spells during which she might behave in a nasty way towards him. Then I told him he must be on the alert and protect himself by fighting back. As a consolation, after this statement, I told him gently that there are many loving people on this earth, that I, for one, loved him dearly, and that he must reach out for love whenever it was offered him—in school, with teachers, with other children, etc. He answered: "I know!" And his answer was firm and unneurotic. He also told me that he had somebody who gave him "quite a bit of good love and was very handy." This person was his father, whom up to now he had not mentioned.

The next and last phase on Larry's way to health was the dissolution of a birth trauma. One day Larry indicated that he felt anxiety in the head. He covered himself with a blanket, walked around with his head covered, gasping for air. The sniffling, which had almost disappeared by this time, recurred suddenly. It was pretty strong. I could clearly detect it through the heavy blanket. He walked solemnly with carefully measured strides. He took great care not to expose his body, and did not permit any beam of light to penetrate the blanket. This hooded little child performing a strange ritual was funny to look at. I felt an urge to laugh, but checked myself immediately because a strange feeling of deadly earnestness imparted itself to me. My next thought was that this sensing of earnestness must have a connection with the change from darkness to light. At this moment I noticed that during his walking Larry—under his blanket—made anxious, pushing-forward movements with his head. The slow pace of the continuation of his rhythmic walk made me think: "He is on a weary journey and wants to move from darkness into light. He is yearning for light, therefore is pushing his head towards it, yet he is deadly afraid of it. He withdraws into darkness, but there, too, feels frightened. He can neither go back nor forward, and this moment must produce unbearable anxiety." I understood intuitively that this anxiety originated at the time of his birth, and that he had made a courageous attempt to liberate himself from it. This attempt of his represented a logical continuation of the process which therapy had set in motion. I prepared him to expect still stronger anxiety, and promised to help him liberate himself completely from it, as I had done on previous occasions. I then pulled off the blanket, lifted him in a horizontal position high into the air, supporting him under his head and buttocks, and suddenly dropped him within a few inches of the floor. I repeated this procedure, increasing the intensity of movement by raising myself on my toes and bending my knees. Thus I gave him the feeling of "losing ground," and reproduced the falling anxiety which,

no doubt, he felt during his first attack of anorgonia on the threshold from prenatal to extra-uterine life. The effect was incredibly violent. He went screamingly through the greatest anxiety he had ever experienced. I repeated throwing the blanket over him and pulling it off. Thus I produced, at the moment of transition from darkness to light, a withdrawal of energy towards the center, followed by an extension towards the body surface. This could easily be observed through the alternating pallor and rosy color of the skin, as well as the corresponding anxious sniffling, and deep, releasing sighs. Gradually he calmed down and almost fell asleep.

During the next session I waited for him to indicate what he wanted to do. He reached for the blanket, spread it on the floor and said: "*You* lie on it!" I complied. He wrapped me up, opened the blanket and wrapped me again. I peeked through a chink, waiting to see what he would do. Again his behavior became solemn; he strutted to the extreme corner of the spacious room. Then he ran towards me and jumped over my body, still covered by the blanket. He repeated these motions many times. His leaps became marvelously free, as I could observe in the mirror on the opposite wall. Then he pulled off the blanket, screamed happily, and leaped over me, back and forth, literally flying through the air. Afterwards he ran in circles and I felt he wanted companionship, so I joined hands with him while falling in with his movements. He had achieved complete freedom of movement, combined with a lovely sense of rhythm. After a while he took a bird house from the toy shelf and placed a few blocks inside. He called them little baby birds. I asked him where the babies came from, knowing that he had proper knowledge regarding the sexual act and process of birth. He said: "From my mummy's tummy," while he kept placing the baby birds into the dark house and taking them out again.

At this point one might pose the question whether his symbolic action indicated knowledge of the elements of his birth trauma. I should like to answer in the words of another child. This child was craving information about the question where babies come from. When I had explained several facts regarding the sexual act and the act of birth, she exclaimed: "You know, I knew all this long, long ago, while I was still in my mummy's tummy!" Children have an unconscious knowledge of biological happenings, which they express in an uncomplicated manner. It is easy to understand their language of words and movements, once one has acquired a genuine feeling and understanding of the basic biological functions of life.

On completion of his symbolic actions, I made Larry lie down, and saw that the orgasm reflex was completely established after the dissolution of his birth trauma. When I checked with his mother about his birth she asked her gynecologist for information. He said there had actually been a hindrance because the head could not push through on account of an irregularity of the coccyx. During this painful phase of the birth the mother remembered having had suicidal ideas before going under anesthesia, to end the pain and "life in general"!

During the next session Larry masturbated with satisfaction and said: "You are a marshmallow!" At this point I should like to insert a few words about masturbation of children in general. Despite Reich's repeated statements that no neurosis exists without disturbance of orgastic potency, I am struck again and again by the fact that parents and educators alike, although claiming to be familiar with sex-economic theories, fail to recognize the lack of orgastic potency in neurotic children. In reporting a child's symptoms people express their astonishment about the child's neurotic behavior with words like: "I can't understand this because he masturbates and, I am sure, without guilt feelings, for we never interfere and always tell him that masturbation is a natural thing!" But in the same breath they will state that the child had an unsatisfactory nursing experience, or that the child, when left in the care of a nurse or relative, had severe frustration of his impulse to move.

A child's guilt feelings about masturbation are not the *only* factor in the disturbance of its orgastic potency, as has been repeatedly stated. Any pregenital frustration impedes orgastic potency during the masturbation period and later.

In Larry's case full orgastic potency could only be established after a successful release of the energies which had been found in his muscular armor during his frustrations on the urethral and oral level. Even then his orgonotic pulsation was still disturbed on a deeper level through the birth trauma. Only after his breakthrough on this deepest level the establishment of his orgastic potency became possible. There was no trace of any guilt feeling in his case, and yet he had inhibitions to masturbate up to the last breakthrough.

This constant recurrence of illogical thinking in regard to the cause of a child's orgastic impotence may be explained by the fact that among all the sexual frustrations which the average adult remembers from his own childhood, masturbation anxiety is the most vivid conscious recollection.

This emotionally conditioned disturbance of logical thinking and its resulting tendency to overemphasize one factor, while neglecting other important factors, is dangerous. From the therapeutic point of view it prevents a complete cure. From the sociological point of view it gives antisexual society a chance to continue its destructive work undisturbedly.

Larry's orgasm reflex now remained steady and he was free of symptoms. Meanwhile the discrepancy between his mother's desire and her ability to love him had, however, become unbearable to both. By agreement with Reich the mother started therapy with me, in an attempt to break through her frustration towards Larry. I worked with her for about three months, during which time she experienced partial subjective relief. Yet she developed a terrific hatred against me since she transferred all her destructive impulses from Larry to me. One day these took on such gigantic proportions that I felt too endangered to continue her treatment, whereupon she threatened to harm her child instead of me. At this point she had already steamed off sufficient destructiveness so as not to carry out her threats regarding the child. Because there was no possibility of helping her further, she asked me, nevertheless, to continue helping the child during this critical period.

I saw Larry the following day. He was well balanced, but sad. He asked for love when it was time to leave, but was completely undisturbed. He even showed me a few rolling head movements which he had "invented," in order to make himself "soft" whenever he became stiff and afraid. He used the words: "I can do everything by myself!" I trusted his statement. A few weeks later he told me that his mummy was very bad, but that he was getting along. I now see him only at intervals of from three to four months, and show him love and give him assurance. Therapy has not only made him symptom-free, but has provided him with the necessary stamina and knowledge to fight the dangers of his mother's disposition.

EDITH

Edith, aged two, was brought for a therapeutic session by her mother, who had made hasty arrangements for the maid to call for the child at the conclusion of the session. For some reason or other the maid did not show up, and Edith had to remain with me. I could not reach either the mother or the maid by telephone. I am usually very careful in the selection of the person calling for the child at the termination of a therapeutic

session. My preference depends on the stage of the treatment. If the plasmatic pulsation of the child is still weak, or if there exists a tendency to anorgonotic attacks through the influence of disappointing experiences, an abrupt transition from the therapeutic situation into reality through immediate contact with the main frustrating person must be avoided. In such cases it is advisable that a person not close to the child's personal difficulties calls for the child. During a later phase of the treatment, when the child's love impulses have become steady and intense, the frustrating person usually becomes aware of a change which has taken place in the child, conditioned by the session. This is due to the excitation of the person's own orgone field through the child's reestablished stronger pulsation.

Mothers are apt to exclaim: "You feel so different! You look so well, what happened to you?" They actually try to "feel" the change by caressing the child's body. This is the precise moment in which to take advantage of the favorable situation in which to improve the orgonotic contact between mother and child, or to establish it in cases where it had been completely lacking.

I shall discuss the different techniques which I use towards this goal in connection with another case. The inadequate planning in Edith's case was an exceptional incident because of the mother's last minute engagement, which prevented her calling in person for the child.

Edith is a very shy and withdrawn child, who is made to suffer by her mother's lifeless disposition and her conventional ideas about little girls' good behavior. During this particular session Edith had just discovered that such a thing as freedom of movement and joy of making sounds exists, without necessarily having to pay for enjoying these liberties by being called a naughty little girl, as well as losing the affection of adults. She was skipping around and laughing aloud when the doorbell rang. I opened the door and let the visitor enter. It was a lady who had come for her first interview. Just as soon as she saw the happy child enjoying herself in a perfectly natural and delightfully lively way, she gave her one dirty look and addressed her in a shrill voice: "What are *you* doing here, you mean little devil? Why do you make so much noise? You seem to be quite a little bitch!" The child's face turned literally white, then she said in a crystal-clear voice: "*I* am not mean, but *you* are! I have not done anything to you, and you don't even know me. I'll slap you for this!" And she did.

It was one of those situations where a child must be informed that such

mean behavior on the part of an adult is abnormal, although unfortunately the rule, but should in no way influence her naturalness. This must be done in simple words which should be tuned to the child's excitement, and one must make use of its momentary curiosity and readiness to find the causes of its unpleasant experience. If it is given the proper explanation it will be less shocked and not personally disappointed in future similar situations. It will learn to ignore these attacks of armored adults and follow its pleasurable impulses without guilt feelings.

I considered it necessary to demonstrate to Edith immediately that my task was not terminated by freeing her from her anxiety to move freely and to make noises, but that I was ready to help her if ever she got into difficulties for following her natural impulses. I told the visitor that she had no right to talk this way to a little girl simply because she was happy; that for no reason whatsoever she had accused Edith of something which might be characteristic of herself, namely, to act in a mean way. The visitor understood instantly that this was a serious issue, and apologized to Edith. During the interview which followed she seemed to gain something valuable from her first contact with the practical application of sex-economic principles, namely, the knowledge that one can discuss serious life problems undisturbedly in the presence of a child, as long as one does not interfere with the child's personal rights. When she was ready to leave there was a good relationship between the two.

On that particular day which had brought her a breakthrough to natural motility, Edith was very generous in regard to her love impulses. She kissed the visitor good-bye quite spontaneously. It is encouraging to watch how willingly children forgive and forget the wrong done them if they are given the feeling of security that they are right in following their natural impulses. This fact represents our chance to prevent a great deal of lasting emotional damage. We should never grow tired of making use of it in order to counteract the influence of the emotional plague. Our support and reassurance of the child is a powerful antidote against the emotional plague, not only in regard to the few occasions where we have a chance to extend a helping hand, but for many others to come. The reason for this lies in the child's unconscious knowledge that our attitude is in harmony with the strongest force it ever felt, namely, its natural drives.

STUART

Stuart, three years old, was described to me as being a very sick child. Before starting his treatment I spent almost two hours with his mother, trying to get an objective picture of the child's condition. It was impossible to obtain any clear information because she was so neurotic and confused. Reich had just begun treating her. The relief which she had derived from these sessions had given her a basic understanding of her child's neurosis. She, as well as her husband, who was also being treated by Reich, began to understand that the child's neurosis was conditioned by the parents' neurotic behavior. They had a little girl, aged five; she, too, was afflicted by neurosis and was to be treated by me as well. This unfortunate constellation of four neurotic persons living together under one roof had created such an unnatural atmosphere that they had lost the sense of evaluation of normalcy. They were caught in a vicious circle, conditioned by their mutual behavior. At the time of the interview it had just begun to dawn upon the mother that because of this vicious circle there was a possibility of being helped, if the evil was attacked in its entirety. The father felt the same way, but on account of a deep somatic disturbance was not able to take any active steps for his children and had, therefore, delegated the interview to the mother, who was the strongest in the family. The factor of four possessive and constantly quarreling grandparents intruding upon the family life had also to be taken into consideration, but was anticipated to lose importance proportionately with the parents' improvement and resulting detachment from them.

The following data about Stuart's previous history were secured at a later time when both parents had improved: While Stuart's mother was pregnant with him there were constant quarrels between the parents. His mother was extremely unhappy and cried a great deal. During pregnancy she indulged in sadistic phantasies about babies being tortured, which gave her sexual pleasure. At the beginning of the eighth month of her pregnancy her physician informed her that she would not be able to have a normal delivery, but would have to undergo a Caesarian operation. The family, by this time, planned to move into a new apartment. The doctor said that the child was already full grown, and suggested an immediate operation in order not to upset the moving date by childbirth. The mother did not experience any feeling of wrongdoing because her hardheartedness was endorsed by the lack of understanding of biological function on the

part of an "authority." Thus, the child was cheated out of two months of intrauterine life. Because of novocaine anesthesia the mother was fully conscious during delivery and, therefore, remembered a heartbreaking scream as the first sign of her child's life. His face looked like an old man's, and had such an expression of suffering that the mother cried many hours in pity for him. The unhappy quality of his scream at the moment of his birth is characteristic of ensuing, incessant crying. The baby enjoyed his first nursing periods and seemed to thrive at the hospital. Just as soon as he was in his own crib at home, however, he became restless and unhappy, and seemed to become aware of the hostile relationship of his parents. His neurotic sister, aged two, hit him in a fit of jealousy. She became so violent that she had to be pulled away, while one of the four persons present yelled: "Take her away, she is going to kill him!"

From that moment on, the baby became completely hysterical and spent most of the time in tantrums, which were interrupted by happy intervals at times. Up to the age of three, Stuart often refused his food, but when he did eat made a mess of it. When he was to go to bed he had hysterical fits, getting his mother so angry that she slapped him at times. This seemed to calm him down; he even smiled occasionally, as if pleased with himself to have forced his mother to show her real face. He never slept the night through, but like most neurotic children woke her up many times, requesting to be picked up. This was repeated frequently and lasted many hours. As he grew older he showed an inability to speak clearly, and also that he was bewildered, both in his words and behavior. This became even more noticeable to others, because the parents were too unhappy and numb to comprehend it.

My first impression of Stuart was one of terrifying sadness such as I have never experienced in a child before. Stuart cried without ceasing, clinging to me, and when I spoke to him raised his voice to loud screaming. His body felt like iron, his head was very hot. I tried most patiently to soothe him, but understood very soon that it was impossible to get his attention. He was lost in sadness. Any psychological approach would not only have been fruitless, but impossible, because he was so disturbed that he did not seem to understand my words. I began working on his armor. I did this in the boldest manner which I ever applied in any treatment, because I was under the impression that the mental disturbance had reached a point where time was precious if I wanted to succeed in preventing the outbreak of complete mental fog. I worked most concentratedly by passive

movement, by swings through space, falling manipulations, and actual breaking of muscular tensions on the release of anxiety. His whole system seemed to be too weak to experience any rage. The child gave me the impression of raw flesh without any protective skin, despite his healthy complexion.

From the very first session I went into minute work on one part of his body after succeeding in releasing tension in another part. This was done by movement and complicated body twists, rapidly performed, leaving no means of escape for the child. From the child's liveliness during his utterances of anxiety and protest, I drew the conclusion that he was born with a strong orgonotic system. But his complete loss of pleasure-capacity made me suspect that a disturbance of orgonotic streaming had taken hold of the entire body. Because of the basic strength of orgone charge, the discrepancy between strong charge and weak streaming, this represented a dangerous condition. Therefore I considered it imperative to break his armor as a whole instead of proceeding gradually from one part of the body to another, in order to avoid the danger of anorgonotic attacks connected with a partial breakthrough. In his case this might have led to a total disturbance of his weak pulsation. I was fully aware that this unusually rigorous breaking of his armor meant a terrific strain for the child, not only on account of the great amount of anxiety released, but also as an excitation of the muscles and nervous system. Yet, I saw but one chance of a cure in this procedure. It was encouraging that even during the first session the child had spells of complete relaxation. He had a peculiar way of constantly pressing his penis when unhappy, from the tip inwards towards the body, but apparently without feeling any sensation from this manipulation. The entire procedure looked to me like a holding on to something for the sake of consolation. Deep inside he felt that he could derive it from his penis, but since his pleasure-capacity was disturbed it only increased his feeling of being lost. Between his anxiety attacks he sucked his thumb very pleasurably, and at such times gave up his frustrated manipulations of the genital. At the end of the first session he began to talk in a complaining, whining voice. All I could understand was that he was very unhappy and felt ill-treated because of a broken victrola record. This went on for about ten minutes until the end of the session.

The next morning the mother told me, overwhelmed with joy, that on the evening of his first treatment Stuart had gone to bed peacefully for the first time without crying, and slept throughout the night. She also told me

that for months he had almost driven her crazy by constantly complaining in a whining voice about records, without being able to make himself understood. The more he felt that his mother could not follow him, the more his compulsion to talk about records increased. The day after his first treatment he had ceased doing this, and instead started playing in an amazingly relaxed way. During the weeks which followed he mentioned records only occasionally and quite casually, and then forgot completely about them.

I treated him once a week. Right at the beginning of the second treatment he showed a rather wild urge to lean over my shoulder. I understood that his anxiety of being detached increased after the first cracking of his armor, because of no healthy functioning person in his close environment. He felt cold and lost. While holding him my hands glided over his body to give him warmth. My previously gained impression of his raw flesh had changed to one of being suddenly thrown into a pool of ice-cold water. At that moment I understood how he must have felt during the sudden diminution of pulsation while being expelled from the warmth of his mother's womb. His cell system had lost its capacity of adaptation to life because of the incompletion of intrauterine development, as well as of the shock connected with it.

My therapeutic measures from now on were directed towards two goals: to make up gradually for this lack of adaptation by actually helping him to re-experience and discover the fact that he was born. I planned to let him relive his one major shock by releasing, bit by bit, minor amounts of anxiety, through creating the same biophysical conditions as the initial trauma. My second goal was to spare him further shocks by eliminating the armored behavior of his mother, and to reestablish orgonotic contact with her.

After getting the main difficulties of her neurosis under control, Reich had, meanwhile, transferred her to me for treatment. I had only had one interview with the father, in order to determine his attitude towards his children. By this time he lived, on Reich's advice, temporarily apart from the family, but saw his children occasionally. I had to ascertain how far I could count on a revival of his paternal feelings, or whether I had to adapt the child to his fading out of the picture. At this time he did not know how he felt, but later, as I had expected, he informed me by letter that now it was clear to him that he loved the children. He said there had been times when he felt an urge to throw his little boy out of the

window when he cried, but that apparently this block of loving feelings towards the child was removed by the treatment.

The older sister responded well to my treatment, and made me optimistic in my assumption that with the reestablishment of her capacity for love she would behave normally towards Stuart. She had frequently expressed desire to love him and repeatedly said: "I am jealous of Stuart when he comes to see you, but I have such a funny feeling that I want him to be here. When he comes from you I don't have to hit him so much!"

I proceeded with greatest intensity to release Stuart's anxieties by breaking his muscular armor. In the midst of an attack of anxiety I would swing him through the air, while I ran through the spacious studio. I would put him on his feet abruptly in the center of the room and quickly withdraw. At this moment the anxiety would reach its peak and he would scream; then I would come back, pick him up and give him feelings of security and warmth by putting his head on my shoulder. Then again I would make him move together with me in a rhythm which corresponded to his momentary mood, and gradually withdraw myself again. Thus he learned to move freely and became a happy child. One day he reached for the string attached to the electric light and pulled it for fun. This has become a sign that children have begun functioning, if they do it after the release of anxiety. At this moment I always place myself in back of them, so as to catch them in case of pleasure-anxiety unbalancing their equilibrium. When the light went on Stuart was jubilant with joy, but turned pale, fell backward, and would have struck his head unless I had caught him. I cheered him up and let him repeat the procedure while holding him in my arms, gradually letting him slide down. Now he was ready to enjoy the pleasure fully.

The technique mentioned above was applied for about four sessions. Then he either lay on the floor or cuddled in my arms while I worked on his muscles. He experienced a great deal of pleasurable thumbsucking, and gradually the empty feeling of his penis seemed to subside. Slowly the orgasm reflex appeared and there were definite pleasurable sensations in the genital. One day he seemed to be on the threshold of the masturbation phase after a very successful release of muscular tension of the pelvic floor, which led to spontaneous urination while caressing my hand. The tension of the anus and rectum had already subsided previously with the release of gas. The abdomen was no longer blown up.

During all these sessions he had continued to tell long stories of broken records, damaged scooters, pianos out of order, coal trucks which would not move, all in his former whining voice. None of these stories made sense, and it was extremely hard to even distinguish the words he uttered. I did not attempt to understand "psychological connections." Instead of straining my ears to understand his words, I tried to perceive with my whole being what his body expressed, and in what way the rhythm of his biological behavior was interrupted. As a result of this I felt that he still needed liberation of breathing, although his breathing had already greatly improved. I applied complicated manipulations on the intercostal muscles. This brought about a deepening of the breathing and his eyes began to gleam. Spontaneously he changed his stories to the effect that the records were wonderful, the scooters big, there were plenty of large coal trucks on which he would drive me to the store and buy me anything I wanted. He was so big, he said, that he could buy and drive trucks just like a big, big man! He would buy so much that my son and his daddy would even have enough. (From the very beginning he had asked me repeatedly whether I had a child, and he seemed always very happy when I answered this question in the affirmative. It seemed to me as if he wanted to reassure himself that there were healthy mothers. He did not ask this question out of jealousy, but in order to create hope in his own behalf).

Gradually I detected through observation that the tenor of the incomprehensible record stories became whining when there was acute disturbance of orgone pulsation and withdrawal of energy. And it became jubilant when expansion became possible through reestablished pulsation under effective manipulations of the muscles. This is another "Leitmotiv" as a psychological expression of biological perceptions. It is interesting that the "Leitmotiv" had ceased to exist outside of the therapeutic situation, while the mental deteriorating process continued under the surface, as the treatment proved. I attacked this phenomenon by yelling at him: "Stop that whining voice. Nobody will ever be able to understand what you want and you won't even know yourself! When you are unhappy use a good strong voice, and with the sound of the voice you and others will know what you want!" I started a conversation with him and scolded him each time his voice dropped to weakness; then we yelled together for fun. The result was incredible. His eyes lost the empty look and he played and talked intelligently. He hugged and kissed me, saying: *"Now* I understand, *now* I know." Then very seriously in a loud tone: "I must be very careful to talk loudly, then I can do everything. I make it very strong now, then everything is easy!"

He showed an intelligence and independence during the games which followed which was astonishing. When his mother called for him he could hardly wait to tell her: "Mummy, I must be very careful with my voice. Imagine, I even could turn on the victrola by myself because I know about the voice; I make my voice strong now." I said: "And Mummy has to be careful in using *her* voice and so have daddy and sister." Mummy agreed, saying: "That's right, Mummy's voice stinks even more than yours!" Knowing that her inhibited voice was one outstanding manifestation of her neurosis, she said: "I try just as hard as you do to get rid of it," and took him in her arms. I left her alone with the child as I had done on several previous occasions, to let the two find contact with each other.

During her next session I informed the mother that her understandable, complete helplessness in making a decision for Stuart (such as going to the park or having lunch first), which any healthy mother would do instinctively right, had to stop. During the time he kept complaining and whining because of his general unhappiness she had gradually become so insecure in regard to her lack of motherly impulses that she did not even dare to follow these any more. This had aggravated Stuart's feeling of isolation to a point where he gave up making himself understood, and lost his ability to communicate with others in a normal way. I told her that she must regain initiative, so that he could feel taken care of, even at the risk of having made a mistake.

In a preparatory way I had drawn her into this function at the end of each session while dressing the child and making plans for his further amusement. We both discovered with satisfaction that she developed a marvelous intuition to adapt herself to the needs of her improving child. It seemed as if her own orgonotic system had greedily waited for contact with the child. She sometimes wept with joy. The tempo of her improving relationship with her child was far ahead of her own improvement of neurosis. Finally the last link in the understanding of Stuart's mental disturbance was given to me when the mother told me one day that she used to play records to calm the child when he became irritated during breast feedings, or when he would not fall asleep. Later she had developed the habit of sitting on the record cabinet while nursing him.

Stuart has a natural love for music and a strong sense of rhythm. During these early musical experiences he must have suffered doubly from

his incapacity of experiencing pleasure through the combined frustration of his longing for love and oral gratification on one hand, and enjoyment of music on the other hand. The mother had meant well by offering him something enjoyable as a substitute for love and warmth, which she could not provide for him, but she had failed to recognize the fact that the disturbance of his pleasure capacity as a whole also destroyed his pleasure in listening to the music. Since both experiences were extremely strong according to the nature of their drives their content became decisive in the choice of Stuart's "Leitmotiv." Later it attached itself not only to records and victrolas, but to machines and devices in general, as described above. According to the natural development of a child who would like to enjoy using and watching machines and devices at work, but feels impeded on account of general unhappiness and lack of spontaneity, this variation of the main theme is easily understandable.

When Stuart had completed his twelfth treatment, he had acquired a general clearness of speech, and his bewilderment had given way to normal intelligence. This was not only observed by the parents, but mentioned in great astonishment by people not familiar with the fact that he was being treated. He slept well, ate with gusto, and his constant fatigue subsided. Since early infancy he had suffered from alarming constipation and frequent attacks of gastric spasms, which made the use of drugs necessary. The constipation subsided immediately after the first treatments. The stomach attacks recurred only once when he saw his grandparents against my wishes, but this could be checked without the use of any drug. Stuart now does everything in a relaxed way. To use the mother's own words "there are no more complications." He feels subjectively happy. I intended to continue his treatment solely for the purpose of carefully watching his development and strengthening his system for the complete establishment of the masturbatory phase.

After two sessions I gave this plan up, according to the child's own indications. Upon the conclusion of the first session of this kind he cried violently and fell back into his former restlessness. The mother was alarmed and called me up. I spoke to Stuart over the telephone and understood from his remark: "I want to go to your house," which he corrected fast into: "I want your house to be at my house," that the continuation of the treatment interfered with the complete establishment of orgonotic contact with his mother. He still reached out for me and, thus, withdrew part of his energy from perfect functioning with his mother.

When he came for his next session I asked his mother to stay with us. Stuart liked this suggestion and climbed on his mother's lap. Soon he became restless and cried. I took him on my lap. He calmed down and smiled. After a few minutes he became unhappy and longed for his mother. He switched a few times between us. When he was smiling happily I asked him: "Do you still want me to have my house at your house?" He said firmly, "No," and hugged and kissed his mother. Then he said: "I am going home now, and I don't have to come back any more. I don't need you any more." While he spoke I opened the door widely for him, saying: "You are right, and that is definite." He took his mother's hand and walked happily out with her. The happenings of these two sessions represent a deep biological process, during which the child ceased drawing orgonotically from me as a mother substitute and, instead, established complete orgonotic contact with his mother. Both mother and child were ready for it by that time. It would be a mistake to look at this complicated biological process only from the psychological point of view, as the dissolution of a mother transference to the therapist.

Had I been unable to change the armored behavior in Stuart's surroundings at a time when the parents' and the sister's treatment had not yet been completed, the success of Stuart's treatment would have been endangered. It was important that his experiences in reality harmonized with his inner perceptions of improvement. Had there been a discrepancy a new bewilderment might have set in. I eliminated the anxieties resulting from the grandparents' armored behavior by temporarily prohibiting any contact with them, excluding them from the family circle. When Stuart got better I limited their visits to rare and short occasions only. This resulted in great relief on the mother's part, who only now awakened to the fact that the grandparents had taken advantage of her helplessness by intruding on her maternal rights. Thus, they added to the alienation of affection between mother and child.

Now that all unfavorable factors in Stuart's environment were removed to the greatest extent possible, the vicious circle of armored behavior on the part of all persons concerned had been successfully broken, and the prognosis was favorable.

JOHNNY

Johnny, seven years old, is a basically healthy child. His life was built on the principles of self-regulation in regard to his bodily needs, as well as

to his mental development. At home he was surrounded by love, and did not suffer from any sexual frustration. From early infancy his parents tried to defend his personal rights whenever they became aware of the fact that someone interfered with his development. They tried to eliminate unnecessary difficulties for Johnny because of contact with particularly armored persons. On the other hand, they in no way influenced his contact with the outside world. Thus, they learned that a healthy child does not show the slightest inclination to shyness. He meets children and adults alike with loving outgoing impulses. If he feels disappointed because the other person responds with hostile, armored behavior, he simply discontinues this contact without any lasting impression on his emotions.

Whenever Johnny complained of having met hostility without his doing wrong his parents tried to get an objective picture of the situation. If they felt that Johnny was right they tried to stress this fact. Moreover, they taught him that adult people are not infallible, and that a natural behavior just like his, may offend people who are void of it. They recommended him not to compromise with those unnatural people, though this might get him into difficulties, since he would be backed by the parents' support as long as he needed it. Even as a young child he showed amazing ability to stand on his own feet in an armored world, because he felt basically secure.

Only one serious incident, at the age of three, seemed likely to make a lasting impression on his emotional life. At that time he was living at a rooming house, the entrance to which was above street level, a few steps leading up to the house. One day when Johnny came home with his mother, he pushed the bell button several times for fun, as children are wont to do, without realizing possible unpleasant consequences. The husky, ill-tempered janitress appeared in wild fury. She purposely pushed the door open with such force that Johnny tumbled down the steps head over heels. The woman yelled: "Now I hope you learned your lesson for disturbing me all the time!"

Johnny's mother decided instantly that it was important to change the result of this lesson, and so gave the woman a strong push in return. It made *her* roll downstairs, landing her next to Johnny, who was so perplexed that he forgot to cry. She lifted Johnny and carried him into the house, while giving the woman an explanation meant for the child: "If you push Johnny, I have to push you!"

A few hours later, when Johnny was playing by himself, his mother overheard him repeating her remarks in weighed words over and over again. From then on the janitress always avoided meeting Johnny. He could have suffered a trauma from this experience, and a twist in his personality towards submissiveness might have resulted; instead he gained an everlasting feeling of security which determined his nonchalance for years to come towards attacks of the armored world.

Johnny's capacity for happiness, his creativeness and intelligence, had a captivating influence upon people. He was liked by everyone and did not run up against difficulties of importance until the age of five. His desire to spend the summer at camp was granted. Among a fine staff of counselors there was one exception, in the person of a woman possessed of masculine sternness. She tried to teach him "discipline" and feelings of shame for his body. Johnny was prepared to meet these difficulties because he was told beforehand that life in a large group of children and adults would probably bring him in contact with people who did not share his natural attitude towards the gratification of his sexual needs. His mother explained to him that many parents teach their children that sex is dirty and that masturbation is a great sin for which they will be severely punished. Furthermore, she informed him that these people often lie when their children ask questions about birth and sex. She told him that it would be unwise to try forcing his knowledge and viewpoint on these ignorant children. When he expressed astonishment at this suggestion she explained to him that children who are brought up with wrong ideas about the facts of life are confused and afraid; therefore he might get into difficulties without being able to help them. The first visiting Sunday in camp Johnny thoroughly discussed with his mother the problems in connection with the antisexual attitude and disciplinarian actions of his counselor. They came to the conclusion of completely ignoring her. Pretty soon the counselor acquired the same attitude towards him because she recognized the futility of her attempts to scare him or make him submissive.

It is important to inform any sexually healthy child in a natural, understanding manner, of the contrast between his own clean, uninhibited feelings with regard to sexuality, and those of dirt and sin in the average armored adult and child. If this enlightenment is imparted without sign of fear on the part of parent or educator the child will easily grasp the guiding principle for the avoidance of possible pitfalls. Experience has taught me that children are basically tactful. When they are allowed to gratify their natural impulses and are treated in an unauthoritarian way

they show great understanding for other people's weakness and treat them kindly. Thus, their freedom from anxiety and lack of secondary drives automatically eliminates the meanness and cruelty which is characteristic of armored children. They rather show a compassionate and regretful disinterest in armored persons who interfere with their rights. I frequently observed this attitude in healthy children towards persons playing a more or less unimportant role in their lives. An emotionally healthy child might shock armored people through being natural, straightforward, and unwilling to behave in a submissive manner, but he will completely lack the subconscious element of vindictiveness of the "enfant terrible." If a child deeply loves an adult who agrees with the child's right to freedom, yet on account of his own restricted childhood and its resulting character structure does not act on his belief in this freedom, the child instinctively senses this unconscious interference with his rights.

This happened to be the case with Johnny's father. Therefore, a frank discussion to clarify the confusion in Johnny's feelings became necessary. Johnny was told, in his own language, that being brought up without freedom results in copying habits and attitudes from early surroundings. His father, like everybody else who was disciplined in his youth, naturally followed the pattern of his early surroundings. His later experiences brought him to the conviction that children have a right to freedom. Johnny was asked to realize these reasons for his father's shortcomings and, in case of controversy, to become less upset. This explanation took the sharp edge off the conflict; however, there remained one point of uneasiness. Johnny felt relieved by the assurance that his father's actions did not indicate any lack of love, but he could not understand that a person could not change his behavior. He yelled furiously: "Is that so? I'm convinced that Daddy could change if he tried hard, he simply doesn't want to. Why are children told all the time that they can do everything if only they try hard? Why must *we* always try hard, and the adults have the right to do just as they please? Why don't they try hard?" Any further explanation seemed fruitless on account of his inability to imagine rigid feelings of any sort. Nevertheless, his bitterness subsided for the following reasons: first, he had been allowed to give vent to his rage; second, he sensed his father's loving attitude because an attempt had been made to ease Johnny's hurt feelings; third, and most important, Johnny's father had never interfered with the gratification of Johnny's sexual impulses because he fully agreed with Reich's theory of the biological functioning of pleasure.

The father's positive attitude towards Johnny's *basic drive, namely his sexuality*, fostered his feelings of being loved and generally protected. Johnny felt that his father was with him, for he not only granted him sexual freedom but had always defended it. This feeling dominated his emotions, and thus diminished the importance of any other conflict.

Johnny's first teacher in school was a snobbish and superficial person. Overdressed and vain, she strutted about on high heels, making an effort to keep her balance. She was restrained in movement, taking tiny steps with unbent knees and holding her pocketbook tightly pressed to her chest. Johnny was struck by her ridiculous appearance and complained of feeling bored in her presence. His parents agreed with his judgment and used the teacher's artificial personality as an example of a person whose grotesque appearance corresponded to her emotional emptiness. They encouraged Johnny's instinctive rejection, steeling his impulsive judgment through objective explanation about the characteristics of an armored adult. This helped him to overcome his disappointment in the teacher, and also sharpened his recognition of armored behavior in general. Whenever he faces hostility or disciplinarian actions from someone whom he recognizes as an armored person his immediate reaction could be expressed in his own words: "This hurts, but I won't take it seriously, because this person is crazy anyway!"

During the years to follow he learned gradually that the majority of adults act unnaturally. Around the age of six it dawned upon him that the same was true of his playmates. Through this realization he became confused and began to compare his own body with that of armored children. There was a period during which serious doubts arose in his mind as to whether *his* natural behavior and correspondingly relaxed body were the norm, or whether that of his armored surroundings were. Repeatedly he stood in front of the mirror, throwing his pelvis back, pulling his chest up, holding his breath and tightening his arm muscles. When asked the reason for this he blushed, saying: "I just tried how it feels to look like the other children!" It was necessary to explain to him how this tense and unnatural appearance of other children came about. He was told that if he formed the habit of copying them he would run the danger of diminishing his capacity for love and happiness. Gradually he regained his feeling of being right, despite his isolation. More important than the explanation itself was the fact that he was supported by love and warmth during these discussions. A slight regression was apparent in his manifestation of longing for

love. These needs subsided automatically as soon as the temporary insecurity was overcome.

One day he watched a ball game of a group of boys which was conducted in a rough manner by a counselor, who obviously encouraged sadistic impulses in the fighting boys. Johnny asked abruptly: "Am I rough? Do I yell? Why doesn't my body look like theirs?" His mother asked whether he would like to change places with them. He laughed and said in embarrassment: "No, but it makes me feel scared to be so different." As an answer his mother engaged him in a conversation about his favorite activities. While he beamed about some project of his he realized the wealth of happiness which was his, and the anxiety subsided immediately.

The school which Johnny attended was poorly cleaned. The children frequently soiled their hands and clothes on the dusty desks. One day the principal reprimanded Johnny for his unclean appearance. She threatened to punish him if she should ever see him again with dirty hands. He was disturbed by the unreasonable demand, and asked his parents for advice. They pointed out that the principal had no right to admonish a child about dirty hands as long as she did not see to it that the school was properly cleaned. On the next recurrence Johnny mentioned his parents' opinion to the principal. He did this in such a matter of fact way that apparently she considered it wiser to drop the subject.

A few days later the principal opened a money drive for the improvement of the school building. She promised a reward to the child bringing the largest amount of money. Johnny felt bad without knowing why. Johnny's parents engaged him in a discussion of deeds warranting a reward as opposed to unearned wealth through inheritance, lucky business transactions, or capitalistic exploitation of the working class. It was explained to Johnny that the school was attended mainly by poor children who were at a disadvantage in this contest because they could not compete with children of wealthy parents. As a result of this discussion Johnny lost all interest in the "reward." He recognized the contradiction between the motives which characterize genuine giving, and those of the ones fostered by the principal.

The proper handling of these seemingly unimportant incidents is of great significance in a child's development. Our support cannot spare him unpleasant experiences and suffering from armored behavior, but it can diminish and even prevent lasting emotional damage through its strengthening influence.

Parents and educators have repeatedly asked me the following question: "Don't you consider it dangerous to incite a child against persons who by means of their position or *merely by being an adult* feel that they have a right to be regarded as an authority? If, for instance, a school principal, teacher or counselor, or a physician or nurse, even a waitress in a restaurant without personal relationship to a child, are not treated in a respectful manner they are certain to feel indignant and will fight back." As regards the conflict in a therapeutic situation, the question sometimes arises whether it is dangerous to incite a child against his parents. The intensity of the widespread anxiety in regard to these questions can be judged by two characteristic remarks: A neurotic person warned me that children who miss authoritarian upbringing, it is true, are free from muscular armor and neurotic character traits, but instead will commit suicide because of the discrepancy in their feelings and those of the armored world.

The other remark was made by an educator, who told me that Neill had become his guiding prophet in matters of education after he read his books. Nevertheless, he pointed out that he considered it extremely dangerous to expose a child to the conflict of recognizing hypocrisy in his teacher's behavior. He expressed this viewpoint while discussing a child's anxiety, which could have been easily averted through the parents' honest admittance of the teacher's unpleasant personality.

It goes without saying that I do not consider it either ethical or useful to incite a child against anybody for the sake of undermining the child's opinion or spoiling the relationship between the two. Such a procedure would be irrational and mean. However, the situation changes if the child is endangered through a parent's destructiveness and inability to love as, for instance, in Case History #1, of Larry. Here, and in similar cases, when parents' or educators' armored behavior threatens to break down a child's life impulses and to impair his mental development, the child must be enlightened about the interference with his rights. His natural demands for love and freedom and his capacity for self-defense must be restored and strengthened. This requires always an objective discussion of the frustrating person's qualities. If the painful recognition of negative qualities in the adult leads to an incitement of the child, it cannot be avoided. In this case, I consider the incitement ethical because it serves the purpose of granting the child happiness, health and freedom. In therapy it is often advisable to continue strengthening the child's feeling for his rights in the face of the frustrating person. This is best done at the end of a session.

It clarifies the situation for the parent, who will pretty soon recognize the alternative of either changing his armored behavior or losing the child's love. It also gives the child an intense feeling of security. This process is just as important for the success of therapy as the breaking of the child's muscular armor and the dissolution of his neurotic character traits, because it links therapy with the realities of life.

Around the age of six, Johnny began to discover the more or less hidden predominance of sadistic impulses in most children. His original enthusiasm for group playing lessened, since the constant recurrence of some form of cruelty in all games spoiled his enjoyment. Filthy jokes about excremental body functions, and compulsive secret sex talk, using vulgar language, were never missing at children's gatherings. Johnny felt partly embarrassed, partly bored. He began to understand that the world to him looked different than to his playmates. First he tried to bridge this strangeness by ignoring it. Later he realized that by doing so he became an outsider. This feeling was unbearable because it interfered with his natural longing for companionship and his strong desire for group playing. His instinctive recognition of the danger of losing contact with other children, and the anxiety which any necessary withdrawal of natural outgoing play-impulses produces in children, forced Johnny into artificial behavior. He began to follow other children's pattern of expression, although it was obvious that the words he used were meaningless to him. The purity of his feelings remained unimpaired, but he seemed to believe that "When in Rome, do as the Romans do." He even tried to outdo other children by imitating *their* expressions and outshouting them. This phase lasted about three weeks. Careful analysis of the child's motives, coupled with loving support of the parents, gradually helped him to overcome his first tendency to compromise with his armored playmates.

A similar feeling of insecurity took hold of Johnny during his next summer vacation, which he spent on a small country place. Pretty soon the children of the summer guests formed a gang with the native children, spending most of the time playing, hiking, and exploring together. As soon as the children became familiar with one another, the usual secret sexplay began. They also engaged in whispered discussions, during which they attempted to put together bits of sex information clandestinely arrived at. They scared one another by repeating threats of punishment which they had individually heard from various adults. Because Johnny did not participate in their discussions he excited their curiosity. They asked him

whether he was scared to talk about sex. He answered that he was not the least scared. His parents, he said, did not share the view of those who believed that masturbation was sinful. He also was not afraid of getting excited by little girls whom he loves. He added that as long as he can remember, his parents had always answered questions about sex in the same way they answered any other question. Johnny described the children's reaction as something astounding. They could not stand his attitude and tried to convince him of his parents' wickedness because they did not scare him in the customary way, which would save him from the terrible punishments which follow masturbation. Then they decided that things were probably not so bad. They assumed that Johnny's parents, after all, were not as sinful as he had described them and Johnny had lied about it. They tried to make a test by uttering dirty sex expressions in front of Johnny's mother, waiting for her reaction. They became puzzled because Johnny's mother, familiar with the suffering of armored and sex-inhibited children, continued to be kind to them and did not scold them for their use of dirty expressions. Gradually they changed their tactics and became confident. They seemed to enjoy being with her and Johnny but at the same time were seized by great anxiety about their liking such wicked people. They bothered Johnny constantly by telling him that something must be utterly wrong with his family, and that some day God would punish them. They compared their own parents' behavior with that of Johnny's parents in a disparaging way. One day, while taking a walk, Johnny said something disrespectful like "Shut up!" to his mother, whereupon one of the little boys exclaimed, looking reproachfully at Johnny's mother: "If I said something naughty like that to my mother she would smear soap in my mouth!" Then he added boastingly: "Yes, she has done that several times!" Gradually most parents regarded Johnny as a danger to their "sound educational principles." Apparently they felt urged to demonstrate their disapproval of his freedom, which they called "disobedience," as often as possible. Consequently they greeted Johnny on every occasion with "Mind your mother!" On another occasion a controversial discussion about the existence of Santa Claus was forced upon Johnny. When he answered honestly that he did *not* believe in Santa Claus an adult smacked him, saying: "But *our* children *do!*"

All these unpleasant experiences seem to slide off a healthy child as long as he is constantly supported in his strong belief of being right. Whether or not this is done in a humorous way, or by serious discussions, or by

combination, as it was best for Johnny, depends upon the individual child, and is of minor importance. The decisive factor is the maintenance of security and protection, through the parents' or educators' undisturbed attitude, in the face of such difficulties. They must be tackled in an undramatic way; there must be no sign of impatience or being tired of dealing with the hostility of the armored world. Complete absence of fear, which characterizes any genuinely protecting action, must emanate from the adult's behavior. It can only be achieved through the conviction that any difficulty must be surmounted by our active help when the child's right for emotional and sexual freedom is at stake. We must take the pains of examining thoroughly the acute, individual difficulty. However, each case must be considered and dealt with as part of the great complex of sociologically conditioned difficulties which arise wherever sex-economic principles are applied. If the situation is carefully explained to the child this broad viewpoint raises the individual case above the smallness of personal antagonism and thus eliminates bitterness and disappointment. He will then not feel helplessly exposed to the attacks of armored human beings.

It was possible to guide Johnny through the above mentioned struggle so successfully that he emerged an unusually happy and healthy child. What remains to be seen is his reaction to and experiences of his love-life with little girls. This is not within reach of anybody, because it concerns the kernel of his being. What happens here is the criterion of his emotional health.

At the age of five he experienced deep love for the first time for one of his classmates. Both children gave themselves completely to the experience under the most favorable circumstances. When they met for play they spent most of the time undisturbed by others. The relationship was completely happy, but of short duration. Johnny felt oppressed by the girl's frequent spells of hopelessness, caused by her mother's indifference, with resulting crying spells of release. And further by the lack of warmth, which changed the loveliness which she displayed in other places, when he saw her at her home. Johnny's reaction to this behavior was: "She becomes dull and cold like her mother."

This happened at a time when at his own request he changed schools. He was transferred from a strict public school—about which incidents were described above—to a less rigidly conducted and more interesting one. Apparently he was pleased with this incident as an outward reason

for the separation from his girl friend, for which he was emotionally ready. He kept a happy, loving memory of her. When, in the course of events, he had various relationships, the girls mostly reacted lovingly to begin with, but withdrew in anxiety as soon as he became strongly sexually excited and touched their bodies. There were only two girls who had no inhibitions whatsoever. Both were rather wicked children, one being the daughter of a drunkard. Their lack of inhibition was not due to a natural, healthy attitude but, on the contrary, to neurotic lasciviousness. They grew up without any care whatsoever, like stray cats. Occasionally the parents paid them attention by spasmodic discipline in the form of beatings, at times showering them with gifts and treats as their whim directed. Johnny was the first boy they ever met who did not suppress his sexual impulses, therefore they considered him wicked like themselves. Each of these girls used the same tactics on him in short succession. They used him as a victim of their sadistic impulses. Here, in short intervals, he met two girls who responded to his sexual excitation. This attached him to them. They tried to change this attachment into a submissive fixation. They tortured him by making it a condition that he would share partly nasty, partly dangerous activities with them if he wanted to enjoy their company at all. They kept him in constant tension by aggravating the conflict of temptation to follow them in spite of his better reason. This continued for several weeks. Gradually he understood that he was dealing, in either case, with girls who excited him sexually but whom he did not love. This made the relationships intolerable to him and he stepped out. It took him quite a while to get over this disappointing experience. Then he confided in his mother. It seemed as if he had the urge to find expression for something which he felt very clearly, but the recognition of which made him feel no less sad than any healthy adult, namely, the fact that in an armored world sexuality has lost its identity with love. He put it in simple words by saying: "Too bad, it could have been *so* lovely, if only they had not been so wicked!" But more than his words, his eyes expressed the seriousness of his statement. He matured through this experience, which left no trace of impairment of his love impulses.

To sum up the main principles for the protection of the healthy child against armored behavior, we have to revert to the different groups described at the beginning of this article:

In therapy we must try to exert our influence on as many people within our reach as the problem involves. If possible, this should be done in cooperation with the child.

We must strengthen the child and help him to acquire a character structure void of neurotic traits, yet suited to survival in an armored world. We must sometimes compromise by taking into consideration the fact that our generation of children, being pioneers, is transitory. Therefore, we should, if necessary, guide the children towards over-development of self-defending character traits, which under ideal conditions in a healthy society, would need less emphasis.

We must help them to understand armored behavior by being honest in our explanations as well as serious, yet not anxious in our warnings about its dangers.

Healthy children must be protected from infancy against armored behavior. In early childhood the protective actions must bear such an explanatory character that they convey their meaning automatically to the child.

As soon as the child has sufficiently matured, explanation about the existence of armored behavior and its dangers must be given and means to fight them must be taught.

The child must be made to feel that the burden of defending him is gladly carried by the adult as long as needed.

The same principle applies to *children having attained health through therapy*. The only difference lies in the fact that they need stronger assurance and support at the termination of their treatment, because they have to make up for time lost during the period of neurosis.

SEX-ECONOMY AND ORGONE RESEARCH IN PALESTINE*

By WALTER HOPPE, M.D.

1. HUMAN REACTIONS TO THE ORGONE ACCUMULATOR

Francisco de Goya, the great Spanish painter of 200 years ago, once said that phantasy, freed of the shackles of reason, would lose itself in the absurd and chaotic. What this artist comprehended intuitively, Freud tried to clarify by his scientific investigation of the Unconscious. Reich, however, recognized the irrational structure of all humanity as the expression of the emotional plague, and by his discovery of the biopathies, has given us the means of taking up the fight against this mass disease. Reich states: "The fight against the biopathies will be one of the most arduous tasks with which humanity was ever confronted. I do not hesitate to contend that no previous revolution nor such achievements as the conquest of the plagues of the Middle-Ages can compare with this task in magnitude, depth and danger. The solution of this task will probably require the greatest revolution in thought and action which man has ever had to achieve."

When Freud "shook the sleeping world" with his discovery of infantile sexuality, the resistance against the discovery could be explained by moralistic dogmata of thousand years' standing and by the anxiety caused by the making conscious of unconscious conflicts. It is more difficult to find the causes of the irrational resistance against the orgone accumulator which creates strong biological reaction in the fight not only against cancer but innumerable other disease forms. Reich states: "The orgone energy has yielded some therapeutic results which are so incredible that I have not dared to publish them lest I appear as a charlatan." The fear that the magnitude and the variety of therapeutic successes might arouse suspicion, particularly in the beginning, is only too well justified.

As we all know, today penicillin is known all over the world as a miracle drug. Yet, the characteristics of penicillin had been known long before the war; they had been described by the English bacteriologist Fleming as long ago as 1929. However, no attention was paid to his work and, without

* Translated by the Editor.

the urgency of the war, penicillin probably would have remained unknown. After the Japanese had taken Java, the Allies had to search for a substitute for quinine, and it was "discovered" that DDT had a deadly effect on mosquitoes. In reality DDT had been discovered 75 years ago by a Swiss chemist; again, it was "rediscovered" when the war made necessary the preservation of "human material." As we see, human lives lose considerably in value during the war when it comes to the enemy and gain value when it comes to one's own ranks. This shows the whole life-inimical attitude of our mechanized civilization which admires the machine but has contempt for life.

True, the "machine" called orgone accumulator is no imposing affair. Physicians as well as lay people like to refer to it, somewhat derisively, as "the box." Some doubt the justification of calling it an "accumulator" because no use of electricity is involved. Few people can imagine a medical apparatus without electricity. Thus, a patient, when she felt the characteristic prickling sensations, remarked that now I had switched on the electric current. How much more imposing had been the treatment with an electric "hair douche" in a fashionable Berlin sanitarium which made the hair stand straight on end while all the physicians concerned knew that the whole thing was a bluff. Now comes the accumulator from America, and many Europeans, used to thinking in such categories, are inclined to call it an American bluff, ignorant of the fact that the discovery of the orgone took place in Europe.

Again and again, the therapeutic successes achieved with the orgone accumulator are ascribed to "suggestion," again and again by critics who do not take the trouble of even investigating the matter. Also, it does not seem to have occurred to any of these critics why the inventor, if bent on misleading his public, should choose as his means such a primitive "box" which lends itself poorly to a "suggestive" influence, which, more than that, by its very simplicity, is apt to arouse skepticism.[1] A surgeon sat, fully

[1] *Editor's note:* During the 1920's it was discovered that common warts can be cured by suggestion. The method was used at a famous Dermatological Clinic in Switzerland. The hand with the warts was placed on the top of a pantostat, the warts were painted with some red fluid, and then the motor was turned on. The red fluid was an inert substance, and the electricity was used solely for the whirring *sound of the motor*: there was no electrical influence whatever. The pantostat, then, was used merely for its suggestive effect. Hoppe's point here is extremely well taken: if one wanted to use the accumulator for "suggestive" purposes, one would certainly put on it some mysterious gadgets, like shining switches, lights of various colors, a humming motor, etc. That is precisely the thing which impresses not only the layman, but—probably even more so—the very critics who voice these irrational objections.—*T.P.W.*

clad, in an accumulator for five minutes; when, after this time, he did not feel the prickling, he said, derisively, that he seemed to be a poor medium; as far as he was concerned, that was that. Another physician, a family friend, refused even to look at this "suggestion box" and risked the break of a friendship. I could not help feeling that he considered it a competition with his short-wave apparatus and his ultraviolet lamp. Another physician to whom I wanted to show the accumulator was more direct: "The scientific aspect of it," he said, "I don't understand, neither does it interest me. And practically, it is of no value to me because you have the monopoly (!) on it." Quite generally, among physicians as well as lay people, there seems to be more interest in the possible financial exploitation than in the therapeutic effects. An institution in the Spa Tiberias ordered an accumulator from us. My letter asking for what purpose it was needed remained unanswered. Apparently, the sanitarium there wished to be up to date. The fact that the Orgone Institute is a non-profit organization is incomprehensible to many and the statement of this fact is often met with disbelief.

We meet resistance, however, not only in people who have an antagonistic attitude toward the accumulator from the beginning, but also in patients and their relatives who at first were in favor of orgone treatment. Although I never make any promises and keep emphasizing the experimental nature of the therapy, the expectations are tremendous. Many patients are very impatient and expect immediate visible results even from one session. It helps little to point out that in many cases it takes considerable time before the first visible effects appear. We know from psychoanalytic experience that patients who seem to have a particularly high confidence in the treatment are often covering up a strong distrust which, at the slightest provocation, may appear as a strong resistance. Similarly, in the case of orgone accumulator treatment, the initial confidence often turns into an all the greater skepticism with the first real or seeming failure. Particularly is this so when, as in the late stages of severe diseases, there is initial improvement which, after a certain stage, is not followed by further improvement. If the condition gets worse in spite of the orgone treatment or if some other disease process develops, there is a tendency to make the orgone accumulator responsible. A cancer patient in the last stages was so weak that he could use the accumulator no more than three times; immediately, the family council split into two parties, one of which ascribed the weakness to the accumulator. On the other hand, if there is

symptomatic or general improvement, this is apt to be ascribed to other causes, particularly if the attending physician is asked for his opinion. Recently, a patient with severe attacks of angina pectoris seemed very eager to start orgone treatment. After improvement had taken place very promptly, he refused to give any credit to the accumulator. The suggestion of orgone treatment had been his son's. The negative attitude of the father becomes understandable when one knows his aggressive attitude towards his son. After there had been no attacks for several weeks and the general condition had improved greatly, the father declared that he had undertaken the orgone therapy merely to please his son. When the son, after the first treatment, noticed a strong reddening of the face—a phenomenon well-known to us—the father ascribed this to the effort involved in putting on his trousers. The mother took a "neutral" attitude, saying it was a good thing anyhow for the father to sit in the accumulator twice a day because it would keep him quiet.

Many people, as a result of improvements, admit that "there must be something to it" but at the same time doubt the far-reaching significance of the discovery of the orgone. Their irrational structure makes it impossible for them to draw the only possible conclusions from their own observations.

A particular phenomenon is the attempt of many patients to hide the accumulator from friends or the attending physician. It looks as if some new kind of underground movement were developing here.

Even though there is still much of this inimical or distrustful attitude, it must be said that there are also a great many forms of rational reaction and that the number of friends of the accumulator is constantly increasing, as a result of personal observations and the literature published so far.

Generally speaking, most people, due to their authoritarian structure, are waiting for "recognition" from above, that is, from the official scientific authorities; this in spite of the fact that, apart from the handful of orgone specialists, all scientists, no matter what their specialty, can only be laymen in the field of orgone research. Recognition can no more be expected from a mechanistically oriented science than Freud could expect recognition from experimental psychology. It is more than likely that the orgone accumulator will attain its recognition from below, from the people, on the basis of steadily increasing therapeutic results which finally will eliminate all irrational opposition.

2. REACTIONS TO A LECTURE SERIES

The violent reactions against Wilhelm Reich's discoveries, especially the Norwegian press campaign after the discovery of the bions, were at first incomprehensible to me. But his scientific publications seemed to me so clear and logical that these attacks did not turn me against them, but, rather, did the opposite. After all, the literature is full of scientific publications which later on turned out to be erroneous; as a rule, they simply go into oblivion, without any song and dance. Even if the discovery of the orgone had been proven erroneous, the violent campaign against Reich still would have to be explained.

When, in the fall of 1943, I decided to present the findings of sex-economy, including bion, orgone and cancer research, to a larger public in a series of talks, I soon learned to understand the irrational reactions against Reich. Even in a small circle with closer acquaintance with sex-economy, there soon arose peculiar differences of opinion. One of our friends objected to the public presentation of these scientific problems as long as they had not been officially recognized by established authorities. It appeared that the same people who, in the fields of economics and sexuality, without being experts, nevertheless believe themselves competent to form an opinion of their own, keep a respectful distance from all other fields, which they consider the exclusive domain of the experts. What, we must ask ourselves, is the reason for this basically different attitude? We know that the fields of economics and psychology touch upon the most personal feelings. Economic and sexual suppression can produce violent resistances against economics and sexology, but authoritarian credulousness reigns with regard to research not connected with specific emotions. Modern science, together with the enormous technical advances, has earned general admiration. For this reason, there is little understanding of the fact that there is irrationalism in scientific research.

The fact that a considerable part of scientific discoveries and inventions comes from outsiders is generally unknown or overlooked. What is known, however, is the fact that these discoveries and inventions—to the extent to which they do not serve destructive purposes—always could establish themselves only against the greatest obstacles. Peculiarly enough, this fact is always recognized as true for the past only. I have even heard the explanation that, in the past, it was due to the low development of traffic

and communications. Even stranger was the explanation offered by a psychoanalyst who thought that such resistances only exist as long as the experiment has not proved the opposite. Such explanations only show the complete ignorance of the depth process of irrational phenomena. In reality, it is again and again the same resistances which oppose any and all basically new discoveries, no matter in what field. One only has to mention Galileo, Pasteur, Schleich, Freud and Madame Curie.

One of the most difficult tasks in my talks was to make clear the difference between mechanistic science and functional orgone research. A suppressive education, over thousands of years, split up the *identity* of emotion and thinking and, increasingly, made it into an absolute antithesis. This eliminated the unitary experience of our biological pulsation with that of the outer world and led to the abstractions of our mind, a mind which, in contrast to our "animal" instincts, came to be overevaluated. People were no longer able to comprehend natural processes with their feelings but only by mechanistic thinking. This emotional impoverishment paraded as intellectual objectivity while the remaining feelings became enmeshed in mystical and ideological considerations. Goethe knew this when he said, "Und wenn ihr's nicht erfühlt, ihr werdet's nie erjagen." ("And if you can't feel it, you'll never catch it.")

Thus I gradually began to understand the warning which Reich had addressed to me when informed of my plan for these talks: "Your enterprise is interesting and important and I wish you the best success. But I must add a warning. Please don't forget that the people who come to you do so, on the one hand, with expectations which stem from the biological nucleus, that is, from genuine longing for life but that, on the other hand, all people, whosoever, have in them a character armor which, no matter how good your intentions, may very easily bring about irrational reactions, anxiety and hatred. Don't ever forget that man, at one and the same time, has a great longing for life and a tremendous fear of spontaneous aliveness. I would like, as best I can, to prevent your being taken unawares by reactions of the emotional plague."

In the early phase of my talks, I overestimated the interest in detailed questions of education or the effects of the orgone accumulator, in that I took this interest in details as identical with an interest in the total problem. Very soon I discovered that the overwhelming majority of interested people encountered the greatest difficulties in really comprehending the unity in the natural process. Again and again I found that most of them

had only their own limited field of interest. Resistances became apparent even in a small circle of friends when the discussion went beyond the boundaries of psychology. Others, who had found a strong interest in orgone research, suggested to me to leave out the sexual problem as much as possible in order to avoid unnecessary attacks. Thus, people interested in physics did not want to hear of biology, people interested in medicine of psychology, people interested in biology of physics, people interested in psychology of any of the other branches of natural science.

When, at the beginning of the second series of my talks, I described the resistances with which all progressive ideas and discoveries had met in the past, I encountered more opposition than before. Apparently, I had, in some of my listeners, hit the core of these difficulties when I pointed out their connection with human rigidity as compared with the biological motility of the animal. An electrical engineer criticized my discussion by saying that he had not come to listen to a discourse on psychology; what he wanted to hear about, rather, were the electroscopic reactions in the accumulator and proofs for the therapeutic efficacy of the accumulator. His resistance against the connections between sex-economy and orgone research was shown in his staying away even on the evening when orgone research was being discussed. It was also characteristic that, upon my mentioning the catastrophic significance of the atom bomb, his mechanistic thinking took the line indicated by Reich who wrote: "One might say that the way in which man reacts to these basically different processes and forms of atomic energy reflects the antithesis between rigid mechanism and alive functionalism." The atom bomb, said this critic, was not so dangerous, since for every aggressive weapon a defensive weapon was found.

Of particular interest is the mode of reaction of the political activists. I do not mean people like the politician and sociologist who, after listening to one of my talks, said to his wife that the sexual problem was a matter for women, and that she instead of he should go to my talks; or the politician who said that the Russian five-year-plan was more important to him than orgone physics. People like these cannot be taken seriously. More important are Marxists who are ready to accept Reich's biological and orgone research. Their attitude toward sex-economy is somewhat like that of Marx to Darwin. They are ready to cooperate with Reich to the extent to which they see progress in his scientific insights, as, particularly, in the fight against sexual suppression, but they cannot accept the concept of "work

democracy." They react as the Zionists react to Marxism: "What good is a socialism in the future," the Zionists say, "if in the meantime the Jews are killed by fascism. Let us, first of all, set up a Jewish state so that we can defend ourselves like any other nation, by means of arms if necessary." The Marxists, on the other hand, argue as follows: "What good is a work democracy in the future while in the meantime we are ruled by power politics. Only a society with economic socialism can establish a sex-economic education." They believe that they can bring up conscious people without eliminating the irrational mass basis. They overlook or underestimate the dependence of the mechanism of consciousness on healthy biological pulsation. They land in mechanistic thinking and in the belief that a mechanical revolution will bring about a socialist society. Mechanistically, they split off sociology from the essence of the functional energy concept, and their attitude towards orgone research is as antithetical, as is that of mechanical materialism to dialectic materialism, or of experimental psychology to psychoanalysis, or of mechanistic physics to orgone physics.

Finally, I was told that I was not qualified to present such a scientific subject to lay people. People who said so overlooked the fact that there are no authorities in the field of orgone research, and that mechanistically thinking scientists have the greatest difficulty in following functional thinking. However, the necessity of making the public acquainted with our kind of working is attested by the fact that the problem of the biopathies has become the most important problem of humanity, a problem, furthermore, which cannot be left to the specialists. Our task is that of making the facts known on a broad basis, and at the same time that of finding people who come into consideration for active co-workership. We do our best to win professional people as co-workers but we are aware of the slim chances here. A scientist who participated in my lectures and who, as the first one here, carried out the bion experiments and confirmed them, asked the University of Jerusalem to check the bion and orgone experiments; the Cancer Institute in Jerusalem, on their request, received material concerning Reich's work. However, the interest in professional circles has remained very superficial. There has as yet not been any serious objective criticism.

On the whole I have the impression that there is a lively and widespread interest but that the number of those who are able or ready to cooperate actively is still very small. As always, youth, not yet in a rut in their feeling and thinking, are most openminded. Thus, a college student set out to translate "Orgonotic pulsation" into Hebrew in order to discuss it with his fellow students. At first, he met with considerable resistance and was ridiculed; but the problems were discussed again and again until finally there was serious interest. But a considerable number of adults, also, to an increasing degree, grapple seriously with the problems of sex-economy and orgone research. As a result of two series of lectures during the past three years, as well as of single lectures and a publication in a local paper, hundreds of people, for the first time, came in contact with these problems. True, many of these will first inquire from the "authorities" what they think about it, although these themselves are laymen in the field. But as sex-economy and orgone research is spread by the written and spoken word, understanding steadily grows. The resistances will be overcome by the constantly increasing proofs and the progress of the research, not in the least by the therapeutic successes. However, it will take a systematic re-education before functional thinking on a mass scale is possible.

ABOUT SELF-REGULATION IN A HEALTHY CHILD

By ILSE OLLENDORFF

The theoretical problems and the questions of an understanding handling of children who are being brought up according to the principles of self-regulation have been discussed on several occasions.[1] But many readers will be interested in the handling of the practical everyday questions of feeding, sleeping and cleanliness of an infant and small child who is brought up entirely on these principles. Young mothers often say that they would like their children to grow up as self-regulating persons, but that they are afraid this would entail too much time and trouble. The

[1] Reich, Wilhelm: THE SEXUAL REVOLUTION, Orgone Institute Press, 1945; Martin, Paul, "Sex-economic 'Upbringing,'" *International Journal of Sex-economy and Orgone Research* 1, 1942, 18-32; Reich, Wilhelm, "Anorgonia in the carcinomatous shrinking biopathy," *ibid.* 4, 1945, 1-33; Wolfe, Theodore P., "A sex-economist answers," *ibid.* 2, 1943, 158-156, and 3, 1943, 62-70; Neill, A. S., THE PROBLEM TEACHER, THE PROBLEM CHILD, etc.

contrary is true: nothing is easier than to bring up a healthy child. True, the self-regulating child will be much more active and will need more attention than a child who is trained from the beginning to sit still and to be quiet, but on the other hand, a healthy, active child will not need the much more strenuous and troubled attention that the quiet and broken child needs when it is crying for hours at night, when it will not fall asleep, or when it gets sick. With the healthy child who regulates his eating and sleeping according to his needs, who has no "toilet training," there is no time wasted with coaxing for hours at meal times to "get some food into the child," no time and energy of both mother and child wasted by forcing the child to sleep at specified hours daily, and no endless waiting by having the child sit on the potty, sometimes for hours, until it finally urinates.

The following observations have been made on a little boy from his birth to the age of 22 months.

After a special agreement with the hospital, the newborn baby was put on the breast 10 hours after birth. He started immediately to suck vigorously, and continued the sucking at each feeding time, although the milk did not start to flow for about 48 hours. The child was started on five feedings, because the hospital routine did not allow for another schedule, but the child was left with the mother for at least half an hour for each feeding and was left at the breast as long as it wanted. Another agreement with the hospital was that no bottle feeding should be made at night. At home, the child continued on the five daily feedings, with an interval between the meals of about four hours. The intervals were in no way rigidly kept, but varied according to the needs of the child. He was never awakened for his feedings, and a feeding would be postponed or advanced depending on when he woke up or was hungry. The child would be kept on the breast as long as he wanted to suck or until he fell asleep and let go of the nipple by himself. When in the fifth month the mother's milk was no longer sufficient and the child cried because he did not get enough, he was given an additional bottle after each breast feeding, and in the course of one week he had weaned himself from the breast without any disturbance in any of his functions. He was kept in his mother's arm for the bottle feedings for a long time, and only after he was old enough to hold his bottle firmly, and could run around and get his bottle by himself, did he drink it alone, lying down on the bed or couch or on the floor.

Since the child did not suck his fingers but showed a need for sucking during his waking hours, he was given a pacifier in his third week which he kept almost constantly in his mouth during the first 10 to 12 weeks, after which time the need for the pacifier was evident only before his falling asleep. At approximately 1 year of age he spontaneously discarded the pacifier altogether. Even after he had discarded the pacifier, the little boy did not start sucking his fingers. His need for sucking is evidently completely satisfied with sucking his bottle at the present time, and he had satisfied his sucking need before on the breast and with the pacifier.

At about 9 or 10 months his orange juice was offered to him in a cup, but he refused it this way once or twice, and continued to drink all fluids out of the bottle. Two months later he asked spontaneously for a glass of water and from then on took water and fruit juices from the cup, but he still, at 22 months, has his bottle in his bed in the mornings, before his nap and in the evening.

When the child started eating solid foods, he was offered his choice of the food and of the amount of food he would take. If he refused a certain kind of vegetable, for instance, he would either be given another kind, or his dessert first, and he would very often eat the refused vegetable after his dessert. Sometimes he would refuse to eat anything, a sure sign that he was not hungry, and he would then eat very well at his next meal. Since he has been able to feed himself, he will sometimes pick out all the meat from his plate first and eat all the vegetables later, or he will pour his orange juice over his meat and then eat with great pleasure. There is no reason why he should not eat his meal the way he likes it. He is given absolute freedom in the order in which he takes his meals, and he usually eats all with great appetite and in a short time. He was never coaxed to feed himself, but he asked for a spoon at about 10 months and ate alone at about 16 months. Since he likes to do the same things he sees the grownups do, he asked for a fork at about 20 months. He eats well with fork and spoon, but occasionally has great pleasure in taking the food with his fingers.

Here again, many mothers are afraid that the child will not get enough to eat if he does not eat a certain amount of food at certain hours each day. They do not trust the organism of the child and think that they know better what it needs. But they overlook the fact that very many children who are coaxed and forced to eat a special amount of food at each meal, are not the healthiest and best-fed children at all. It is quite obvious that it is not the amount of food taken, but the pleasurable way in which it is

taken, according to the needs of the organism which makes a healthier and stronger child.

A few examples will show how well the organism knows what it needs. Some French refugee children who had been living for quite a while in France with hardly any butter or fats and no sweets, started eating butter and sugar by the handfuls when they came aboard the ship where these foods were served in big bowls on the table. They actually dipped their hands or spoons in the bowls, showing clearly that they were starved for these foods. Nobody interfered with the children and they did not show any signs of upset stomachs. After a few days this special hunger lessened and after a week they were eating again the normal amounts of butter and sweets. Our little boy would show for some days a special liking for salty food, he would start licking the salt shaker or would only take salty crackers. Then, again, he would show a preference for some days for sweets, eating honey or sugar on spoons, and taking sweet crackers only. At other times he would show no special preferences but would take what ever was offered to him, both sweet and salty.

The child regulates his sleeping hours according to his needs. He is never forced to sleep at specified hours, neither during the day nor in the evening. He will be very regular for a certain time with his nap hours, but with his growth may shift the length of time and the time of the day when he wants his nap. For instance, for many months, up to about 1 year of age, this little boy would sleep for one and a half hours to two hours in the morning, when he himself shifted his sleeping hours to the early afternoon after his lunch. It was very easy to understand him in his wish. Usually, when he is put to bed for his nap, he falls asleep at once, without getting up or calling for someone. But one day he refused to lie down and started crying. He was taken out of his bed, and later, after his lunch, was put down again and fell asleep at once. The next day, he was again put to bed at his usual morning hour and again refused to sleep. From that day on he was always put to bed after his lunch, with the result that he fell asleep right away. On some rare days he refused to go to sleep for his nap at all. He would then either go to bed a little earlier, or, if he fell asleep later in the afternoon would have his nap then and go to bed later that evening. Although this broke up his "routine" for the day, he would usually go back to his usual sleeping hours the next day. At about 19 months the need for an afternoon nap seemed to be gone more or less, or at least, since then, has not seemed to be the same every day.

In general, the child has slept through the night without interruption since his birth. He falls asleep the moment he is in bed and the lights are out. At the age of about 18 months, when he was teething and did not feel very well, the child woke for two nights in succession, crying loudly, and from his behavior it was quite clear that it was not so much the pain, but the necessity for bodily contact that kept him from sleeping. He clung to his mother with all his force and would not go back to bed for about an hour the first night. The second night, after he woke up crying, his mother put his teddy bear in his bed and he went at once to bed again, falling soundly asleep. After this experience, he now goes to bed every night with his teddy bear or another toy, and has since that time slept through the night as he always did before. His need for bodily contact with someone or something which he loves during the night is satisfied.

When, as a small infant he sometimes lost his pacifier shortly after he was put to bed at night and would cry once or twice during the evening because he was still too small to put it back into his mouth by himself, the mother was warned by many well-meaning people that this would spoil the child to such an extent that he would always cry at night if he knew that someone would come whenever he cried. But the fact is that he always sleeps through at night without any interruptions, and on the rare occasions when he wakes up at night, it is for a very good reason and if he is helped and the reason for his waking up is immediately taken care of in some way or another, he will go back to sleep at once. There is no excuse for the attitude: "let the child cry itself to sleep." When a child wakes up at night regularly and cries, it is not the badness of the child, but the fault of the adults around him that they cannot find the reason for his crying and do not know how to cope with it.

The healthy child who is brought up with love and understanding, who regulates himself in all his functions, will have no constipation and no diarrhea, and will also need no toilet "training." This child was never taken up at night to be changed or to be put on the potty, till the age of 12 months. Only when he had soiled himself and felt uncomfortable and wanted to be changed, was he taken up at night. At eleven months he was put on a potty for the first time, but it was quite clear that he did not understand what was wanted of him. Therefore, the attempt was given up. A month or so later, he was put on a toidy-seat, but he felt very insecure, wanted to get off immediately, and this attempt, too, was given up at once. During the summer, at 15 and 16 months of age, when he was

running around naked a great deal, he began to become aware of his urination and defecation and would point to the puddle he had made. At 17 months, when he woke up dry, he would urinate into the potty and understood what was wanted of him to the extent that he would occasionally bring the potty to make his weewee. By 18 months, without any "training," he had reached the stage of always asking to be put on the pot when he felt the need for it. If asked after a long interval, he would either urinate immediately or shake his head in the negative. Since there was never any special emphasis put on the functions of urination or defecation, it is a matter of fact for the child just like all other functions of his body, with the result that he has never been constipated or had any other irregularities in the elimination process.

At 17 months the diapers were discarded during the day, but were put on at night. At 20 months, the child seemed to resent any restrictions around the genital area, he seemed uncomfortable and restless when put to bed. Therefore, even though he still wet his bed, the diapers were left off during the night and care was taken that his pajamas were loose enough to make it possible for him to play with his genital.

To the questions of how to handle the functions of a healthy child belongs the question *who* handles the child. Experience has shown that the *exclusive* handling of the child by one person, be it mother or nurse, is neither good for the child nor for the adult. To cite an example: The child had been taken care of for several months by the mother in the early morning and in the evening, and by a nursemaid during the day, and during that time he would easily get adjusted to another person in a short while. However, circumstances suddenly made it necessary for the mother to take exclusive care of the child for about six weeks. During this time the child formed a very strong attachment to the mother. It became extremely difficult for the child to adjust to anyone else, to form new attachments. Furthermore, the mother, too, suffered from the inability to do her own work, and started to feel the child sometimes as a burden. This is not a single case, but can be observed on every playground when one sees impatient mothers handling their children in such a rough and unloving manner that one feels they would much rather do something else than be with their children. That the children feel this and react to it with spite, stubbornness and hate is not difficult to see.

It is necessary here to mention the fact that the healthy child, no matter how young he is, will react immediately to every person with whom he comes in contact, in an unmistakable manner. He will show distinct displeasure or even start crying when he meets with stiff, unnatural behavior, with loud voices or efforts to be immediately very friendly with him in the usual manner that adults show towards babies. But if, after studying a person for a while, he sees a natural feeling for him, he will smile and after a while become friendly. When our little boy was 7 months old and a change of nursemaid had to take place, he would not stay for a minute on the arm of one young girl who wanted to stay with him, and screamed when she only approached him. He would not stay alone in the room with her, and in two days showed no change of attitude. The girl seemed friendly to the adults, but the child must have felt a lack of warmth in her. A day later, he took immediately, after a few hours, to another young girl who had a very good understanding for children, and who was a soft-spoken, warm and natural person.

The child is given all the loving, cuddling and hugging he needs whenever he wants it, without waiting for specified "attention hours." He has shown no signs of destructiveness, but is a very outgoing child who loves to give and to share. To visitors of his own age he brings all his toys, he offers his lollypop to every passing child on the street, and his toy dog's nose is constantly sticky, because it has to share all his meals. Once, while visiting a family who has two dogs, one of the dogs took a cracker out of the little boy's hand. The child was delighted, asked for more and more crackers all of which he fed to the dogs. The next day at home, while he was again eating his cracker, a butterfly was passing him and the child ran after it offering his cracker and was very disappointed that the butterfly would not take his cracker.

At about 18 months of age, the child started to react with spite and crying when he was forced against his will to do something, but he would be very cooperative if told slowly and patiently what was expected of him and he tried very hard to understand the explanations given to him. He loves to take part in the activities of the adults around him, especially in the housework and washing, and he loves to be given to understand that he is helping.

At about 21 months it became very obvious that the contact with adults alone was not enough for the child. He demanded constant attention and seemed bored even when one tried hard to entertain him and play with him. His need for being with other children was clearly to be seen. The moment another child was with him, he played happily and his demands

for attention from an adult disappeared completely. A nursery school was found which promised to cooperate with the parents in the way the child had been brought up till then, and it was amazing even to the parents of the child to see the extraordinarily easy adjustment that this healthy child made to an entirely new environment. The mother brought the child to the nursery school the first day and stayed with the child in the room for about half an hour, after which time the child got interested in the many toys around him and chose a doll carriage to play with. The mother then told the child that she was leaving, but that he would see her and the whole family later in the day. According to the nursery teacher, the child played on for a while and then started looking for his mother. He cried for her for a little while, but calmed down when told that she had gone and that he would see her later. He ate well and slept and played all afternoon by himself with the carriage. He had to be persuaded to go home in the late afternoon. The next morning his mother told him that the car with all the children would come for him and he let himself be dressed very easily and stood at the window waiting for his car. He went into the car without even looking back, played, according to his teacher quietly all day with another toy which he picked out for himself, and came home very happy and satisfied. On the third day he started slowly to play with the other children, and by the end of the first week, was completely at home at the nursery. He now waits eagerly every morning for the car to come for him. When after the second week his mother went to the nursery to see for herself how he was getting along, he was pleased to see her, showed her all the toys, and when she told him after a while that she had to go home again, he said, "bye, bye, see you later," and sat down for his lunch. The nursery teacher of his group told his parents that in her long experience she had never seen another child of that very young age who adjusted himself to a new environment so fast and with such complete happiness. Another remarkable sign of his adjustment is the fact that he was completely dry at the nursery after the first day when he wet himself once. Although he is the youngest child in his group and probably the only one who had no toilet training, he is also almost the only one in his group who is continuously dry.

There is one more point that needs mentioning: The child's mother used the orgone accumulator regularly during pregnancy, and after his birth used to take the baby every day for a short time into the accumulator.

When he was old enough to sit by himself, he got his own little accumulator which he uses regularly every day. The child never had any temperatures or serious colds. The teething was comparatively easy, with only a slight irritability for a day or two. He is a strong and sturdy and very happy child.

Note: This paper was presented at a Parent-Teachers Meeting at the nursery school which this little boy attends. There were about 40 people present. No discussion was scheduled, but a number of parents asked questions in connection with the talk and brought up problems which they had with their children. One mother admitted that she had weaned her little girl from the bottle by force when the child was 2 years old, because many neighbors had told her that this was the thing to do. One father asked whether the use of the pacifier brought about any mouth deformity and whether one should not distract a child that sucks his thumbs. His little boy is 18 months old and sucks his fingers all day long. The parents try to distract him gently from it during the day but allow it before he goes to sleep. Since the child still has his bottle, the parents feel that something is wrong if he continuously sucks his fingers, but they have decided not to do anything drastic about it and hope that he will outgrow it. The same father also wanted to know whether it is true that all children masturbate and was wondering what to do about it. He was answered that the best thing is not to do anything about it; that the child needs the undisturbed satisfaction and that any attitude which would give the child guilt feelings might result either in excessive masturbation or in a complete inhibition with later disturbances in his genital function.

One mother admitted that, under the influence of the grandmother, her little girl was started on toilet training at the age of 5 months, with severe constipation as the result. How much emphasis this family puts on the bowel movement is shown by the fact that the little girl has to bring home a slip from nursery school every day, telling whether she had a bowel movement or not. The child is now almost 3 years old. The same grandmother had made the breastfeeding an agony for both mother and child by insisting that the feedings be made according to a strict schedule. The mother said that during the first 4 months, when she was alone with the baby, both she and the child enjoyed the breastfeeding a great deal, because at that time she did not adhere to any special schedule but fed the baby whenever she needed it. This very young mother, who seemed to have a

very good understanding and feeling for her child, was very emphatic in stating that she would not let anybody interfere in what she feels is right with a second child.

A number of mothers seemed to have guilt feelings about the fact that they brought their children to nursery school at a very early age. Somehow they felt they had failed as mothers since they were not able, for one reason or another, to care for their children alone. It was pointed out to them that what a child needs at that age is other children to play with, and that if a child is happy at nursery school at an early age, the child is ready for this experience at this stage of its development.

One mother who seemed very insecure in the handling of her 3½-year-old boy, showed great anxiety with regard to the feeding problem. She still feeds her child at breakfast and supper because "when I feed him he eats everything I think he should eat, but when he eats by himself, he would eat only half that amount." When one of the teachers pointed out that her boy is much overweight and probably needs only the smaller amount of food that he takes himself, the mother admitted that he weighs too much but that she would not trust the organism of the child to know what he needs. She showed an equal distrust in the self-regulation of the child's sleeping needs. She said that her boy never seems to want to go to sleep. She complained that he wakes up regularly at 5.15 in the morning and that she does not know what to do about it. When asked when she puts the child to bed, she said that he goes to bed every evening at 6.30. It was suggested that she try to put the child to bed a little later, but she felt that he must be so exhausted after his busy day at the nursery school that he ought to go to bed at that early hour. She did not realize the incongruity between her two statements that the child never seems to get sleepy and that she felt he ought to be exhausted.

The head of the school and the little boy's group teacher agreed wholeheartedly with the self-regulatory way of bringing up children, but both pointed out the great need for the education of parents towards this goal.

THE ARMORED TEACHER

By Elizabeth Tyson

The focal point of the armored teacher is her attitude on the masturbation of children. Self-play terrifies her. She does not dream that this fear is but the awakening of her own painful confusion as a child when the natural pleasure in touching her genital was made a forbidden thing. If she dared follow the upsurge of her repressed emotion, she might well do violence to the masturbating child, so intense is the frustration of her own experience, but the repression is far too deep for any such breakthrough, and she turns frantically to what she has been taught—divert or punish the child.

So when little Tommy, aged four, began taking off his clothes in rest hour to play with himself, Miss Jones took him sternly to task. If he as much as dared even to remove his overalls, he was made to stay on his cot in disgrace after the other children went up to the roof. And when Harold, the same age, was observed happily playing with his genital while looking at the house of blocks he had built, Miss Jones said, "Harold is very free with his hands. He must do something constructive at once."

Characteristic of the armored teacher is her ability to recognize the disturbed child without even suspecting the cause or the serious nature of the disturbance. Billy is very aggressive, likely to show little interest in his play, and given to sudden fears and bursts of hysteria. A well-built, lively boy by nature, he will often withdraw into himself and suck his thumb. It is easy to observe a severe inhibition regarding masturbation, yet Miss Jones refuses to consult the school psychiatrist, saying Billy will grow out of it. Ned, in the same four-year-old group, went home and told his mother his teacher said he could not suck his thumb; Miss Jones denied it, unaware that her actions spoke louder than words.

Typical, too, is the attitude regarding toilet habits. Every child is made to go to the bathroom before rest hour whether or not he has any desire to do so. Then it is firmly impressed upon him that he is not to go again during this period except in a case of emergency. The result is no child goes to the toilet while Miss Jones is in the room, but the minute she leaves and I take over, they clamor to get up. One child wanted to go to the

bathroom so badly that when he heard me coming he whispered to Miss Jones, "You go now, hurry up. The other teacher is coming." Later, Miss Jones told me of this remark and said, "You see, you do not have the proper discipline with these children."

It seems incredible that this teacher does not see how tense are the little bodies on the cots, how unnatural and rigid the positions as they lie there waiting for her to leave the room. Nor does it occur to her to examine the significance of the fact that there are four or five bowel movements listed on the chart when she returns. Her only comment is the sarcastic one, "It's a curious association these children have with you." The one time she became at all disturbed was when a little girl said to her, "The other teacher is gooder than you, she lets us go to the bathroom," but she settled even this matter to her own satisfaction by taking the full rest hour for several days.

Her treatment of the little boy who plays with his feces is very indicative of the armored approach to children. She was horrified, and told me that it meant the child wanted to keep everything to himself, even his feces. At once she brought out a chamber pot and said the child must be made to sit on it so that I could forestall any attempt to handle the feces. Knowing the little boy would be humiliated by the very thought of sitting on a pottie, I made only a slight gesture in this direction. The next day Miss Jones talked to him very sternly about good toilet habits and succeeded in frightening him to such an extent that he now dips his hand in the toilet and just touches the feces, thinking no one will know what he does. I was told to watch him closely every day and see that the correct habits were enforced. I suggested to her that it was probably an experience the child had not lived through in infancy and that it might be wise to let him live it through now, but the words fell on deaf ears. No, he must be toilet-trained at once!

This incident gave rise to the plan I keep a chart on the behavior of each child in the toilet. Miss Jones gave as an example a method of a well-known training school for teachers that advised keeping a chart with different colored crayons, each showing the size of the movement, the attitude of the child, et cetera. I refused, looking at her as I did so, and imagining the horror of her expression could she but see herself deriving a frustrated anal pleasure from such minute attention to excretory functions.

During the day there are many small incidents, apparently insignificant, but all part of the unconscious determination of the armored teacher to bring up well-behaved and "good" children. For example, she rarely lets them scream, even on the roof, little realizing this is a biological necessity for all children. She is constantly "shush-ing" them, as well-brought-up four-year-olds should not make noise. When she discovered two little girls putting cloths on their heads, pretending they were waitresses' caps, she put an immediate stop to it. These cloths were to be used as covers on block buildings, nothing else! She has a mania for so-called "constructive" play, as carpentry or blocks, but play for the sake of play she cannot understand. Rolling on barrels is silly, it gets the child nowhere, and he must be diverted. The simple act of piling large hollow blocks into a packing case, a delight of small children, brings a look of impatience and anger to her face. This is indeed a worthless pastime—nothing constructive has been either planned or built!

Painting is an activity Miss Jones tolerates because it is part of the school curriculum, but she secretly believes it has little value. The daubs of four-year-olds, the colors they use, the form and content of their unskillful but significant attempt to put down what they feel on paper, is lost on their teacher. She even suggested I let them paint but one picture a day, blind to the fact that any creative urge, either in child or adult, can never function under such limitations.

Very often an incident will occur which points a door into the unconscious world of the child. A scream suddenly broke the quiet of rest hour and Tony sat up, caught in the terror of a nightmare. "Help me! Oh, help me!" he cried, "My head! My head!" and broke into shuddering sobs. When I told Miss Jones about it, she laughed and remarked, "Oh, most children have nightmares. It means nothing." And again, when little Kenneth made one of his roving attacks on a weaker child and said, "I want to see people hurt. I love it. I don't know why," she passed it off lightly with the comment, "That is silly talk. Pay no attention to it."

The problem child activates something in Miss Jones that is akin to panic. Fearful of herself, she at once imposes extreme disciplinary measures upon the child. Mary is subject to tantrums, due to her parents being divorced and having to live with a very ignorant and selfish mother. She is a lovable child and unusually intelligent. When a violent fit of anger seized her one day, Miss Jones announced loudly that she would not have her in the class and she was to go upstairs in a room by herself. Screaming and sobbing, the little girl was to spend the morning alone until, as Miss

Jones put it, "she understands such behavior will not be tolerated." Finally, under some pretext, I managed to go to the child and picked her up in my arms. In a few minutes the tantrum subsided, she had what she needed—love. When Miss Jones discovered I had gone to her, she turned angrily to me and said, "You simply pamper this child. What she needs is discipline."

One of the more likely indications of the armored teacher is her punctilious sense of order and her insistence that everything be done according to Hoyle. The children must not read books unless their hands are absolutely clean. The bathroom must be spotless at all times. When drinking their juice or listening to a story, they must sit in a circle exactly on the white line painted on the floor for that purpose. Their knees must be crossed in uniform order before they are allowed to come one by one to get their orange juice. They must always talk in turn and not interrupt each other. They can have little chimneys or toy men from the shelves only when they have built a house of blocks, not for any other purpose. One teacher must "lead the discussion" at the dining-room table, the other must keep silent. Children must not have more than two helpings of food, even if they are hungry and there is an adequate supply. Little Harry is not to be allowed to play with the other children's buildings on the roof if he is late to school, though he is very unhappy that his mother sleeps late and he misses most of the outdoor play. If you deprive the child, says Miss Jones, he will complain to his mother and she will mend her ways!

Any close contact with the individual child is frowned upon. The teacher must get acquainted with the child through observation and it must end there. Avoid touching him. If Miss Jones so much as sees me put my hand on a child's shoulder, she loses her temper, "I told you not to lay hands upon the children. It is the worst thing you can do!" she exclaims. And when any child throws his arms around my waist while he is waiting at the head of the line to go upstairs, she barks at him, "Put your hands down immediately. The teacher does not like you to touch her."

Is it any wonder children often develop into cold human beings?

MECHANISTIC THINKING AS THE ORIGINAL SIN

By R. H. Atkin

Today men are above all else mechanics, and so they accept and obey two types of "experts," the politician and the scientist. It matters not whether the scientist makes pills or atom bombs. The so-called intellectual is just as susceptible as the manual laborer so that there have resulted systems of mechanistic thought. The supreme example of this is of course science, which has physics at the top of the scale. Physics is not, therefore, peculiar to a particular human type, shining above less fortunate mortals, but is merely the expression of the general state of mind—the mechanistic state of mind—of the human race. What then is wrong with it? Nearly everything is wrong with it, and it all amounts to the fact that we see before us a world on the brink of self-annihilation, where science is once more in the forefront of the battle, and the accumulated result of centuries of blind and fearful thinking shows itself in the present-day extremes of self-indulgences, promiscuities and prostitutions of all descriptions.

The whole process has been seen clearly by H. G. Wells in his latest book called Mind at the End of its Tether. In this book he tells how he has arrived at the conclusion that the evolutionary process is diverging from the secular. He therefore denies his previous idealism in which he used to see a new "scientific man" rise from the ashes of a burnt-out civilization. Now he expresses the view that the mind of man is no longer able to cope with his world. The only cure, he says, would be a new and improbable man who would no longer be "human."

Now Wells would have us think that this is a sudden thing, but I am not prepared to accept this, being inclined to believe that the diverging process is but the *suddenly-apparent* condition of man's evolutionary state. His *mind* has clearly undergone a decided modification in its processes of thought, and he himself has believed implicitly in each new transition. As religious belief and explanation failed to solve his problem, the problem of happy living, he turned to experimental science. It is not then surprising that he should have been able to develop a certain modest power over his

external world, but now we can see that not only has his new science failed to solve his problem but, worse still, has put within his hands a rapid means of extinction which, by his obviously erroneous method of thinking, he will probably use.

Let us now consider this system of thought called science, and let us take physics in particular. This is the "purest" of the sciences, and the first thing that strikes one is that it is also the most mathematical. Now mathematics is purely a game of reason, as the Greeks fully recognized, and is really the only true expression of human reasoning we have. It cannot, therefore, accept responsibility for what physics does, because the physicist feeds the so-called "known" to the mathematician, who then returns the conclusions to the physicists. If then the conclusions be wrong we must blame the "known" rather than the human reason. If the "known" deviates at all from the complete picture of the world, then, through a series of dependent "knowns," we shall suffer from a cascade accumulation of deviations, and we shall find that we require more complicated theories and therefore more mathematics to explain it all away. Physical theories would then become more and more fantastic and mathematically complicated. This is precisely what *has* happened.

The forefront of physics today is atomic. To explain the whole universe, physicists decided that matter was to consist of molecules to consist of atoms to consist of electrons and protons (two "types" of electricity). Today it consists of electrons, protons, positrons, neutrons, mesons, neutrinos and perhaps even more. These different particles are obtained within a mechanistic pattern consisting of two views, classical and modern (or quantum). The classical or mechanistically *physical* picture was the first to appear, as we would expect. On this view the electrons and protons were discovered and explained as charged "particles of electricity" to account for the various phenomena of discharge tubes. Hence the masses and charges of these particles were obtained by classical methods. When unusual radiations appeared, it was, and is, the habit to ascribe them to new and different "particles" whose masses and charges could be determined relative to the electron and proton.

Now we must not try to complain of any *reasoning* which is implicit in these matters—which would be an obvious philosophical error—for, accepting the "knowns," we must accept the conclusions that mathematics draws from them. It is, however, interesting to see to what heights of phantasy the scientific process leads us. Consider the case of the neutrino.

In studying β-ray spectra for various radio-active substances, it was found by Rutherford and Chadwick that they consisted of "line" spectra, due, Rutherford showed, to the effect of secondary electron emission within the atom, together with *continuous* spectra which served in each case as a general background. The mean energy of the continuous spectrum then pointed to the necessity for a continuous energy of electron emission from the nucleus.

Now the field of study of the atomic nucleus had of necessity, via Bohr and later Dirac, required the general system of quantum theory for its explanation. This mechanistically *mathematical* picture, also known as wave mechanics, postulates the existence of electron and nuclear "spins," or angular momenta, and for this particular problem of continuous β-ray spectra we note that wave-mechanics gives a nuclear spin of $(n + \frac{1}{2})\frac{h}{2\pi}$ for atoms with *odd* atomic weights, where $n = 1,2,3, \ldots$ and "h" is Planck's universal constant. The β-particle, like all electrons, has a spin of $(\frac{1}{2})\frac{h}{2\pi}$ and when it leaves an *odd* atomic weight nucleus, the atomic weight remains *odd*. (We could just as well have taken the atomic weight to be even). This, therefore, requires that

$$(n + \tfrac{1}{2}) - (\tfrac{1}{2}) = (n + \tfrac{1}{2})$$

The old and trusted law of the conservation of momentum therefore appears to be disobeyed. It can also be shown that the mere existence of the continuous spectrum requires the law of the conservation of energy to be untrue. To avoid these embarrassing conditions, Pauli and Fermi postulated the existence of a new particle, the neutrino. This remarkable particle must then have zero mass, be uncharged and possess a spin of $(\frac{1}{2})\frac{h}{2\pi}$.

This piece of scientific inference has shaken even the physicists who are still trying to summon up enough cheek to accept it. Should they ever manage to reject it, it will no doubt cost them another heavy dose of mathematics.

Mention has been made of the wave-mechanical view as opposed to the classical; or rather the mathematical as opposed to the physical. The latter treats, e.g., an electron as a "particle" with mass and electrical charge, whereas the former treats it as being represented by a wave equation. The

physicists are keen to observe that wave mechanics is merely a mathematical representation of a classical electron, otherwise they could not claim to know what they are talking about. It is worthy of note that this mathematical inference gives a basic rule known as Heisenberg's uncertainty principle. This tells us that we cannot give quantities "sharp values" any more, but that if we know the *condition* of, say, an electron (its momentum) as sharp, then its *position* in space can only be known as an unsharp value. Hence we see that we end up by not ***knowing anything***, which to my mind is a very good argument for us to have ***never known*** anything in the first place. Physics has become a science of probabilities and statistical distributions, and will the scientists then never see that all they are doing is juggling with the old equation of $o = o$? One of the great jokes of mechanistic science is the "mind-stuff" inferred by the writings of Eddington and Jeans. It is in actual fact nothing but the result of this "unknowable" state of physics with mystical trimmings. On the other hand, one could easily interpret it as orgone, which would not only *be* the mind-stuff, but would also explain its existence.

This state of science points directly to the fact that the "knowns" are incomplete so that, as we have observed, the accumulated deviations from the true picture of the universe are sending the scientists off along an infinite tangent. Men must either see this clearly and honestly and try to do something about it, or else they will muddle along further away from real life and themselves, even endangering life by their uncomprehended scientific picture.

The above is further brought out by philosophical considerations. Probably the leading philosopher of our time in this sphere is Bertrand Russell. His method of inquiry, particularly in relation to science, has led him to stress the importance of "perception." This he regards as having a physical causation, and the process of perceiving is then a causal chain between the physical and the mental. Percepts as a source of knowledge of physical objects depend therefore upon (1) a reliable relation between the perceiving apparatus and the physical causal chains, and (2) an independence between the various causal chains constituting the percepts. It is clear that condition (2) is in no way complete and our actual knowledge of physical objects can never be sure. Condition (1) means that percepts probably differ greatly from physical reality, and has been allowed for by us regarding science as giving a *picture* of the universe.

To the question as to whether or not physics can be true, we can therefore only decide that there is no reason for believing it can. Physics then must be regarded as a succession of excuses to explain away the approximations of the initial percepts (due to the lack of independence between the causal chains) upon which it is based. Now this is really an extension of what we have already observed about the "knowns" of science, and it is clear that the unreality (by which is meant, of course, the unreality or untruth of the picture) of science finds its cause in the "perception," or the "known."

What, now, if we could possibly develop a science which centers round the process of perception, i.e., the *observer*? We should then, on all these considerations, stand a much greater chance of finding real meaning in the world. Such a "break-out" could conceivably only come through the realm of non-metapsychological psychology, and this, I feel, is what Reich finds himself doing.

Reich, then, I feel, is developing a new scientific process: one which starts from the observer. He himself has pointed out that the first mistake of the mechanistic scientists was in ignoring the effect of the scientist, not only in the process of observation, but also in the subsequent process of inference and deduction.

His work then stands out as that last improbable hope that Wells has desired but discarded as impossible. It constitutes nothing less than a new process of thinking, a ***functional*** as opposed to a ***mechanistic*** process.

It is also clear, then, that his work in the field of biophysics with orgone energy must start from the very bottom. It is not possible to butt into the mechanistic theories of physics and say, "this phenomenon is due to orgone radiation; this is where they have made their mistakes." The effects can be seen all along the line, from the actions of electrical currents in general, through the whole idea of what electricity really is, the field of heat and thermodynamics, to the whole sphere of atomic physics with its present uncontrollable conclusions. The new functional physics must rather develop itself as a whole and not in any piecemeal "borrowing" manner.

But let it be strongly realized that Reich's work is not just another *science* that will replace and improve upon the other sciences. It is a new system of *thought*, a new *process* altogether, and it is clear from what we have already said that man's whole existence must change in line with it.

A recognition of mechanistic processes explains the continued failure of corduroy revolutionaries. All unwittingly they are sitting on the same branch they happen to be sawing off.

The world of art has long been completely dissociated from that of science, just as religion has been, but in actual fact we can see them all as efforts to understand the universe of man. The esthetic sense is surely nothing but the sensation of *living* in the same way as the only true religious experience is that of the mystics. The majority of the people experience neither the one nor the other, so they go to the church for one and the movies for the other. It is indeed significant that all mystics, from Christ and Gautama Buddha to William Blake, Wordsworth, Keats, Inge and Mahatma Gandhi, claim a similar experience, namely, the sensation of *universal love*.

The esthetic sense among the poets amounts to the same thing: the sense of unity (or beauty) which they *feel*, not think. This estheticism, mysticism, call it what you will, has been used by the poets in an attempt to understand themselves in their relation to existence, just as science has sought to be the "reasoning" explanation. Both of them have failed because of mechanistic processes of thought, the scientists directly and the poets indirectly. The period of romantic poetry (with its mystics) was the last vain effort to understand the "soul" before science really took full possession of the mind. The sexuality of Keats, the freedom of Shelley, the combination of these two in Byron, and the nature-loving of Wordsworth were merely the expression of the (desire for a) *functional* explanation. It was therefore to be expected that the development of mechanistic science should have produced a more and more artificial "art" whose main cry is for a "new medium of expression." This is nothing but an admission of the failure to accept a functional process of thinking. The modern art has therefore had, of necessity, to become more unreal in that it no longer attempts to deal with flesh and blood but has begun an extremely artificial business of vague and abstract metaphors in the realm of poetry, and a new latent "truth" in the realm of painting and sculpture. These are all attempts to escape two things. The first is a continued functional art which would have had to develop in opposition to sciences, from the romantic period. The second is a purely mechanistic art which it (art) must always reject in order to be art. The result is the present-day chaos of "modern verse" and lunatic painting.

A similar situation holds in politics today. It is a symptom of mechanistic thinking that men should begin to lose their individualism. The totalitarianism of fascism is only possible because men's minds are able to repress the functional thinking of individualism and are prepared to accept the mounting hysteria of mechanistic processes. Fascism is a disease of *mankind* and not of any one country. Whether it be called communism or democracy does not matter. Soon we shall see it spreading across the face of the earth, and, itself an unhealthy symptom of present-day thinking, it will bring the stupid slaughter of the millions in the unhealthiest symptom of the lot, war.

It is not just coincidence that science should produce atom bombs to be used in worldwide wars, for the two processes, war and science, can never be independent. They can never be independent any more than a man's arm can be independent of his leg. They are both part of the same body and both worked by the same machinery, the brain; and so wars and sciences, art, religion and politics are as much a direct product of man's philosophy, or, rather, the *process* of his thinking, namely, mechanics.

The new, impossible "type" that Wells visualizes is a new *thinker* who must first understand these mechanics and the huge extent of their consequences. I believe that we have found this in the functional thinking of the work of Reich, which has answered this new and terrible problem that we have all felt somehow, and which Wells has been the first publicly to express.

Might I end by saying that it is possible that Reich, his work and his workers, might not survive the present-day holocaust of madness. But if they don't, then *mankind* will certainly perish, and the apes can start laughing now.

THOUGHTS ON THE SEX BEHAVIOR OF AMERICAN SOLDIERS IN THE ETO

By ANTHONY I. SWAROWSKY

Civilians in the United States today are confronted more and more with a phenomenon which seems to them inexplicable and surprising. Many servicemen stationed in Europe, especially in Germany, are reluctant to return home and others who have returned have lost their enthusiasm for the life back here in the "good old U.S.A." They convey by their stories that they had "found a home" over there and that they had a good time

of a kind that a citizen of the United States, without overseas experience, could not possibly understand. "You either were there or you'll never know," they say. But strangest of all to those Americans at home, they seem to be almost antagonistic towards American women.

We know how much the average American hated to be in the army. Let's not deceive ourselves. We recognize those popular statements: "I want to go too" . . . "I want to get a crack at those rats" . . . "What wouldn't I give if I could be over there with the boys," etc., as the incidental—and necessary—slogans of a country at war. In my three years of army life, two of which were spent overseas, I can say that I have found such slogans on the lips of soldiers with extreme rarity. It is true that during combat most soldiers had a great love for their outfit. They had seen it being decimated and did experience a strong and honest feeling of comradeship, but scarcely a man would have remained in the army by choice. Even after the war they didn't like the army. Americans are brought up too freely and democratically to be able to enjoy such a totalitarian institution. They accepted it; most of them understood the unfortunate necessity of being in it, but they didn't like it, and they still don't. Why, then, that sudden change of attitude?

People over here have an uneasy suspicion, enforced by what they read and see in newspapers and magazines, that it is the girls, the infamous "Fräuleins," that make the G.I.s like their stay in the post-war ETO so much. Well-informed persons go as far as to say that the German girls *are* keeping the boys over there longer than necessary. They are the "evil force" behind the soldiers' signing of those three-months-waivers, of which the less well-informed over here know so little. Take it from someone who has been on the spot, and has seen hundreds of soldiers sign them, a surprisingly large percentage of soldiers who "can't come home for some time—the army's redeployment system is awfully slow, isn't it, mom?" . . . or . . . "want to come home, but the army declared me essential," etc., have signed waivers enabling them to stay overseas longer, rather than return home.

Regardless of their knowledge of the soldier's ability or inability to get back home, people over here suspect that their beloved sons or husbands are engaging indiscriminately and frequently in disgusting and vulgar sexual intercourse with the Fräuleins. (I use the term "Fräuleins" as this article is concentrated on conditions in Germany and U. S.-occupied Austria. Since I have been in those territories as a member of the American occupation forces I am best acquainted with conditions there, but things are not so very different in France, Belgium, etc.)

Is it really the influence of the girls that is making G.I. Joe sign waivers? Can the enthusiasm most veterans returning from Germany have for the post-war ETO be attributed to these girls? The answer is YES, only the conditions are different and the effects on the soldiers are much more far-reaching than most people imagine.

Mr. A, whom we will assume to be a rather frank and bold American, might picture the situation the following way: The German girls, having lived for 13 years under a regime that has tended to take "personal feeling" out of sex, and being starved and void of the most elementary necessities of life, are ready and willing to sleep with American soldiers. The C-rations, chocolate and cigarettes are inducement enough. As the usual resistance of American girls against sexual intercourse without marriage does not exist in the German girls, the soldiers become promiscuous, their morals decline. Whenever they feel like it and as often as there is a chance —and chances must be plentiful—the soldiers engage in sexual intercourse at a prostitution level and on that basis. All this is dangerous for the moral standards of the United States. What will those boys do when they return?

This conception, though it has its points, misses the most important factor, as we shall see.

How does the sex life of the soldiers in Germany differ from the above conception of Mr. A?

During my stay overseas I had ample opportunity to observe G.I.-German relationships closely. Mr. A paints a clear picture of conditions immediately following the cessation of active warfare. Given an added thrill because of the non-fraternization law, the G.I.s began to "whore around." (By the way, the non-fraternization law never stopped them from sleeping with German girls.) The girls seemed much friendlier and more receptive than any professional prostitute the soldier might have encountered previously, and sex life, of a not very wholesome kind, flourished.

As soon as the fraternization law was lifted (and outside of Germany before that blessed event) the story changed completely. The soldiers started to "shack up," to use the popular term. No more dark-hallway affairs. No more woods to hide in. No more M.P.s to be afraid of. Things were in the open and comfortable. One could compare the time of the non-fraternization law, as far as sex life is concerned, to the existing condi-

tions in the United States (the role of the M.P.s being played by suspicious parents and gossiping spinster aunts, etc.) and the conditions after the law was lifted to conditions similar in principle to what is coming in the United States, even though in a modified form. Fear of punishment was gone. Having German girls in the quarters or staying at their houses was still not allowed, but as everybody, up to the top-ranking officers, violated those rules, nobody bothered to enforce such regulations.

Promiscuity in the ETO as Mr. A sees it quite correctly, is not much different from the same practice over here. In the United States it might present somewhat more difficulty, but anyone who wants to go to bed with a woman and is not too particular can do so almost any time most places in the United States. How, then, did the situation in the post-war ETO differ from an out-and-out, destructive prostitution? The fact is that it was unnecessary to resort to such conduct—about the most unsatisfying kind of affair there is—to satisfy one's sex desires. The *"bright daylight"* aspect prevailed. Fear and secrecy vanished. There were no gossiping neighbors. The comfort! Surely a soldier had had his chances to engage in intercourse with a girl long before he went overseas or was drafted, but he rarely had a chance to live with the same girl for as long as he chose, have her mind his quarters and wash his shirts and find her in when he came home; to be able to go to bed with her at night, undisturbed and untroubled, just as in married life. (It must be said here that many soldiers in stationary outfits in Germany, especially those in Military Government and similar outfits had beautiful quarters with a room to themselves. In many other instances soldiers lived at girls' houses and not in their billets or if that was not possible they saw to it that the girl got a room somewhere.) *To lead a life equal to a married one in the bright daylight* without being married, that is one thing that most young men in the United States have never experienced. The soldier had his first taste of it overseas and he liked it.

The results were amazing, or rather quite natural to a rational observer. The soldier stopped his indiscriminate promiscuity. He ceased to discuss intimate sexual happenings and incidents loudly and vulgarly with his comrades over a beer. The disrespect in which he had previously held any woman who would indulge before marriage, an unavoidable result of his social heritage and upbringing, decreased rapidly. He started to treat his girl friend with the same respect with which he treated the one back home who never gave in and stayed "respectable." His entire attitude toward sex changed, a change that could be termed: "from pornographic toward sex-economic thinking," "from negative to positive sex attitude."

Now let me be rightly understood. I do not say that all soldiers stationed in the ETO or even in Germany have undergone this far-reaching change. I don't even say that many have, but I do say that a general trend in this direction can be felt. And that, after all, is the important thing. A complete change of this kind in as large a group as we have in the ETO or even in Germany would be of enough force to change the social pattern of the entire United States. We haven't come to that point yet, but we seem to be on the way.

A comfortable, unrushed, sensible sex relationship can, in the majority of cases, be accomplished by a young man in the United States only after marriage. The young couple wanting this immensely gratifying relationship rush into marriage too hastily to consider wisely, seeing that one goal only. Result: the fantastically high percentage of divorces.

Men—and women, too, for that matter—after having had one or more unsatisfying hush-hush sexual relationships believe that they have experienced all there is to experience in sex. They start married sex life on the same emotional basis as was underlying their fear-saturated, premarital sex life; with tragically few exceptions it is a pornographic one. The sex impulse cannot be suppressed. It can only be led into other channels.

Our soldier suddenly being given a chance to reconvert his heretofore misguided sex life into a marital pattern which, because of its very qualities encourages love, warmth, or, let us call it "heartiness," changes back to normal his emotional reactions with a speed that is nothing short of miraculous.

Many, of course, are too far gone and have become too much a part of the pornographic power that has been overshadowing their emotional life to be able to snap out of it as easily as that; but again I can say, the general trend is in an anti-pornographic, sexually "clean" direction. People over here are shocked when they read stories about the behavior of American soldiers overseas. Looked upon rationally, it is actually surprising how well and "decent" the soldiers behave when one takes into account the fact that they have been brought up with terrific inhibitions and prejudices and are suddenly relieved of this burden. That is an aspect I have never seen discussed in print.

In marriage a man knows that this one is "for good." *The first sex relationship theoretically built on a normal basis is supposed to be the last one.* No way out. Stuck.

In the "shacking up" overseas there is no compulsion to stay together if the partners find themselves to be incompatible. *The first sex relationship theoretically built on a normal basis is an experiment without compulsion.* I have observed many times that once the soldier has realized that having one girl friend as a front which could be "respected" and many on the side to satisfy (unsatisfactorily) one's sex desires is not the "right," the healthy and promising road. He does, after some failures, find a fitting companion in whose company he learns to experience how wonderful a real friendship can be if a non-piggish, heart-felt sex relationship is given time to develop without the demolishing influences of fear and hush-hush. *But he must be given that opportunity!* I want to mention here that I have observed remarkable faithfulness in those overseas friendships. Most of the girls were really in love with the soldiers and I have known soldiers who, after having been returned to the United States, have volunteered to go over again or have taken on civil service jobs overseas just to return to their girls. Likewise have I known girls who have waited patiently for the return of their friends and did not as much as look at another soldier despite tempting offers of C-rations and cigarettes.

After a premarital sex life of this kind a young man will be in a position to choose a real partner for a marriage much more wisely and on quite different and far more reasonable a basis than he could have with his background of pornographic sex experiences.

They are German girls, maybe quickly-converted Nazis, which only goes to prove how powerful a factor an honest sex life in a positive direction can be. The German girls are making a virtue out of a vice. Conditions are so confused in Germany that even the social and moral order is overthrown completely. What had to be done secretly and unhygienically before can now be done openly. Who cares? It is with a feeling of resignation that many girls start to move into a soldier's billet, only to discover that this type of relationship gives them a moral uplift which they had never felt while they still thought of themselves as "decent" in dark house corners or under government-sponsored reproduction work. This, by the way, is also the reason why the soldiers prefer the German girls in Czechoslovakia, to the great disgust of the Czechoslovakians. They are far enough gone not to demand "secrecy." They are at a point where they have no more fear of society. They are at a point, strange as it may seem, where they are able to start a healthy sex relationship. America's public complains today that the Germans are being treated too softly by the United States occupation forces and they are right. Sex relationships of this type, however, inevitably invite friendliness and good will. This should give the American girls something to think about.

There is still a lot of pornographic sex thinking and acting going on overseas, but the impartial onlooker, especially one who has been able to observe the change between war and post-war conditions, must admit that the general trend is going the positive, the healthy way. More and more are taking advantage of the opportunity they are offered over there in this respect and more are finding out how things are, for themselves. I have been speaking of a general trend. This trend, however, is strong enough to make many soldiers sign three-months-waivers, thereby voluntarily postponing that blessed event, the home-coming. It is strong enough to make returned veterans "homesick" for over there as they find nothing of this wonderful newly acquired feeling over here. It has suddenly made them aware of the coldness and frigidity of American women.

Isn't it tragic that American men have to find the prerequisite of happy existence in an enemy country?

Americans who fear that their sons and husbands will be changed by the "low moral life" supposedly led in post-war Germany are only too right. The change, however, is quite a different one than they suspect and might have a tremendously far-reaching effect on the entire future development of America's social pattern.

FROM THE HISTORY OF ORGONE BIOPHYSICS

1. OUR CONGRATULATIONS TO FREUD ON HIS BIRTHDAY (1936)*

By the time these lines reach the public, the noise of the celebrations will have subsided and the celebrants will wait for the ninetieth—and, we hope with them—for the hundredth birthday of Sigmund Freud to honor this man again. At that time, there will be a great many articles presenting the data from "The history of psychoanalysis" and from Freud's "Autobiography" to the public. Others, as at this time, will present the main features of Freud's theory and will talk, with more or less conviction, of its revolutionary character. All this is necessary and as it should be.

To us, these celebrations were food for serious thought. From what publications we have seen it was abundantly clear that nowhere was the essential problem, "Freud and his environment," touched upon. It is as yet too early to present in detail the common fate shared by psychoanalysis between 1895 and 1920 and the young science of sex-economy, not to mention the even younger Sexpol movement. The event of Freud's eightieth birthday, however, should not pass without being correctly interpreted. It is necessary to point out what a whole world passed over in silence.

On May 6, 1926, the members of the Vienna Psychoanalytic Society celebrated Freud's seventieth birthday. There were many celebrants, flowers and presents. Freud made a brief speech which will remain unforgettable; nobody dared to make its contents publicly known. Freud warned that one should not let oneself be deceived, that all the praise proved nothing, that the world had not accepted psychoanalysis and continued to be inimical. A few years before, Freud had expressed the same feeling when he wrote that the world only accepted psychoanalysis, here and there, in order better to destroy it.

We fully agree with the point of view expressed by Freud on May 6, 1926. A look at the world and its important institutions shows us that

* First published in *Zeitschr. f. polit. Psychologie u. Sexualökonomie* 3, 1936, 150-156. Translated by the Editor.

things are worse today than they were 10 years ago. We should not relinquish our watchfulness for a minute, for the fate suffered by psychoanalysis threatens our work a hundred times more severely. We experience now a phase of deadly silence on the part of the academic world and other influential circles. On the other hand, there are already signs of a method of benevolent destruction. Sex-economy is being represented as one of the deviations from psychoanalysis like that of Jung, Adler or Stekel. The reasons for this misrepresentation are stupidity as well as malice. He who knows the history of the psychoanalytic movement can see the difference at first glance. All deviations from Freud's theory, without exception, are characterized by the *negation* of sexuality. With Jung, the libido became a meaningless, mystical all-soul concept, the best possible soil for the later Gleichschaltung in the Third Reich. Adler replaced sexuality by the will to power, Rank denied the existence of infantile sexuality. Sex-economy, on the other hand, took its starting point precisely from those basic elements in Freud's theory which originally had aroused the ire of a world afraid of the truth. It developed the *orgasm theory* and tried in vain to incorporate it into psychoanalytic theory where it organically belonged. It clarified the theory of the pregenital infantile sexual drives and built the basis for a characterology which has the sexual process as its core. Character-analytic technique required the full recognition of the laws of sexual economy. Many more things could be added to show why the theory of sex-economy inevitably begins to feel the previous fate of psychoanalysis. If it is to take itself seriously, it must do everything possible to avoid the fate which is overcoming psychoanalysis, no matter how noisy the sham praise of the world may be.

There is, today, nowhere in the world any official institution, pedagogical, psychiatric or otherwise, which has made Freud's revolutionary concepts its own in a serious manner. Where is the mental hospital which systematically investigates the causation of mental diseases by the disturbance of early infantile *sex life*? Where is the academic institution which cultivates the rich treasure of analytic knowledge, engages in analytic research and recognizes its full value? Where is the place where Freud's revolutionary knowledge finds its *concrete* expression? Who would, on the one hand, loudly proclaim his conviction of the magnitude of Freud's work and, on the other hand, take consolation in the fact that, after all, psychoanalysts have been given teaching posts at universities?

Who believes that correct sexual theory could be taught in America of today?[1]

And what do things look like in the psychoanalytic movement itself? The English school is a sectarian circle completely divorced from life as it is. The Berlin Society attempted Gleichschaltung and thus perished. The Hungarian group consists almost exclusively of the house-analysts of rich people, without either scientific development or serious perspective. The Vienna Society is under the pressure of political reaction and ruled by some death-instinct theorists who no longer can be taken seriously from a scientific point of view. The French group looks desolate.

Has the socialist movement accepted psychoanalysis? Here and there *in words*, because political reaction placed Freud in the camp of Kulturbolschewismus. In the Soviet Union, psychoanalysis has been without development for years. There was ever so much talk about the significance of Freud for the workers' movement. Where, we must ask, has this significance become socialist practice? Nowhere. Socialists recommend to the workers the writings of reactionary psychoanalysts as guidebooks to "socialist psychology," such as an article by Roheim in a Hungarian socialist periodical. Revolutionary socialists publish articles on the occasion of Freud's birthday but betray complete ignorance of the fierce struggle that has been going on for a decade within the psychoanalytic movement concerning the problem, "workers' movement and psychology."

The structure of Freudian theory contains contentions of very diverse kinds. Besides the theory of early infantile sexuality there is that of the "primary process" in the Unconscious; besides the theory of repression there is that of the death instinct; besides the theory of the determination of psychic processes there is that of "cultural repression," etc. The world asks for clarity. There are contentions which are indispensable, others which are non-essential, and still others which are only confusing. One would think that a scientific association which proclaims the world-historical significance of psychoanalysis would adhere to those elements of the theory which are basic, sound and leading forward; but the opposite is the case. "Away from the main thing, we like the non-essential things."

[1] *Footnote, 1946:* When I was about to start my lectures at the New School for Social Research in New York, in 1939, a psychiatrist and member of the Psychoanalytic Association advised me to keep off the sexual problem. Many things indicate that the sexual problem, in its social functions is taboo. In spite of this, the prospects for sex-economy in the U.S.A. are good, provided that pornography is soon recognized and properly evaluated.

is the implicit slogan. It is most closely followed by some analysts calling themselves "socialists." They avoid "the main thing" like the pestilence; if they did not, they would find themselves, inevitably and immediately, in precisely that struggle which *we* lead and which they pass over in silence. They do everything they can to obliterate the front lines in the cultural struggle after they have been defined. They are as dangerous as the preachers of the objective spirit. They usurp findings and sabotage their meaning. It is necessary to warn against them.

The decline of the psychoanalytic movement, its adaptation to existing conditions and the resulting sterility are not a matter for personal reproach. We have learned to pay attention to the dependence of science and its development on social processes. Consequently, we profess a *socially conscious science*. We may say that we have taken into our care the revolutionary findings of Freud's theory. This makes it necessary to become clear in our own minds about the existing situation and the factors which will determine the further course of our work.

The general world-political situation—in which we work with a theory of sex which is at variance with all existing institutions and official concepts—promises worse things to come. *This* world *cannot* acknowledge the fruits of our work or make use of them. It was we who were able to show what advantages political reaction derives from the irrational feeling and thinking of the masses, from their longing for happiness and simultaneous fear of sexuality. The diverse socialist parties are so bogged down in obsolete economistic thinking and so preoccupied with the tremendous problems of everyday that they cannot react differently towards us than with amazement or enmity. Nevertheless, much has been achieved in these difficult years. But what has been achieved is far from what is indispensable for the practical accomplishment of our tasks. Apart from the social difficulties, the most important factor inhibiting our work is our own structure.

Our psychological criticism of Freud began with the clinical finding that the unconscious inferno is not anything absolute, eternal or unalterable, that a certain social situation and development has created the character structure of today and is thus perpetuated. We recognized that the fear of the "sexual chaos" is justified but also that it applies to definite historical periods; and our therapeutic work showed us that a different regulation of social living is possible. We have never entertained the illusion that the evil in man can be eliminated suddenly. We learned to recognize the

enormous difficulties which a political psychology must expect if it attempts to bring about a real alteration of human structure. We ourselves, who have made this our goal, are only too often confronted with the weaknesses of our structure. It is not easy to master them, which is necessary if one is to be better equipped correctly to meet the effects of irrationalism in our fellow humans.

Psychoanalysis once worked at the roots of life. The fact that it did not become conscious of its social nature was the main factor in its catastrophic decline. From this, we drew the following conclusion: A science which has as its object of investigation life itself and which finds itself in a reactionary environment must either submit to this environment and relinquish its own principles, or it must organize itself, that is, create for itself the organs which safeguard its future.

Marxist economics was organized politically. In the realm of political economics, the political organization of science arouses no surprise. It is different in other fields. Here, the illusion of an "unpolitical science" has created much confusion. The science of human sexuality is in itself political, whether it wants to or not; consequently, it must draw the conclusions and profess its social nature. From this, the necessity of organization follows. Then, the wealth of new knowledge is no longer at the mercy of this or that accident of social development, but is part of that political movement which has as its goal a rational, scientific guidance of society. No matter how concerned one may be with the irrational thinking within the socialist movement, natural-scientific psychology and correct sexology can have their place only within this movement.[2] Nobody will doubt this who has followed the development of mysticism in Germany and its influence on natural-scientific research. We have no way of knowing today what forms the organization of our work will take in the broad masses of the population. But the necessity of creating a mass basis for it cannot be doubted. This will not only be a protection against reactionary influences from the outside but will also protect us against compromises with an inimical environment. If one is left without social influence the environment will prove the stronger force. If, however, the people who count have understood the value of a scientific undertaking for their existence and

[2] *Footnote, 1946:* This statement is no longer correct. The socialists, led by the communists, have in the meantime regressed sex-politically far behind the most primitive demands. Thus, social sex-economy finds itself in a great void, and its organisation is left to future development.

their future they will aid the struggle and diminish the pressure of an inimical outer world. Nobody can be absolutely sure of himself, ourselves included. If, during a favorable period, we stood out for, say, the necessity of a gratifying sex life in adolescence, a less favorable period may make us, nevertheless, to give up such a contention or even to denounce it. If, however, a sufficient number of adolescents have made our knowledge of puberty their own and are ready to defend it, we are spared such a retreat, and our scientific work is realized. This example may suffice to show what is meant here.

The social anchoring of our scientific work promises yet another gain. Freud started from physiology and discovered the nature of the psyche. Our criticism of psychoanalysis began with the *sociological* concepts of Freud. The consistent study of the interrelationships between the social and the psychic proved highly fruitful for clinical work also. There developed a basically new manner of studying the laws of sexual life. The orgasm theory, with an inner logic, led back to physiology and biology. The nature of the final results of this research cannot as yet be envisaged. The development is in full flux, the results are unaccustomed, the establishment of a biophysiological basis of psychology seems to succeed. We can already say that one of the most important of Freud's expectations is coming to be fulfilled: it will be possible to put the theory of psychic functioning on a solid biological basis. True, in a different manner than one had usually thought of.[3]

Thus, our obligation is twofold: that of safeguarding the practical realization of Freud's revolutionary achievements, and that of safeguarding our own sex-economic research. If we succeed in making the masses of working individuals who are deprived of their happiness understand what our work is about and why we have to struggle so hard, then, sooner or later, they will help us, will, as a social power, protect our work against outer and inner dangers and will themselves reap the fruits of the natural science about life.

No matter how difficult or hurtful the conflicts between psychoanalysis and sex-economy may have been, they will never cause us to forget what we owe to the life work of Freud. For nobody knows better than we,

[3] *Footnote, 1946:* This prediction was confirmed by the later development. It took the form of *orgone biophysics* which developed into a new, fruitful branch of natural science. It owes its existence to the consistent adherence to the orgasm theory and orgasm research at which so many look askance.

nobody experiences more painfully than we, why the world used to damn Freud and today removes him from a fighting reality.

2. THE EXPULSION OF WILHELM REICH FROM THE INTERNATIONAL PSYCHOANALYTICAL ASSOCIATION.*

Introduction (1947): The following report appeared in the *Zeitschr. f. polit. Psychol. und Sexualökonomie* in 1935. It gives a brief summary of the events which precipitated and accompanied Wilhelm Reich's expulsion from the International Psychoanalytical Association. We publish it at this time because doubts about the motives of this expulsion have recently been expressed from various sides in America.

This report appeared in 1935 in the name of the Sexpol and the "Socialist workers' movement." Since that time, the organized Marxist workers' movement has repeatedly expressed its enmity towards sex-economy. The Sexpol has long since ceased to exist, as have any connections with Marxist party politics. What was then called "dialectic-materialistic psychology" has been replaced by *energetic functionalism* since, after 1935, orgone biophysics began to develop. In the meantime, however, the basic findings of sex-economy have found recognition on a wide front. The concept of "social" has become dissociated from the concept of "political" to a far-reaching degree. Similarly, the turbulent events since 1935 have, quite generally, dissociated the new, partly genuine revolutionary thinking from the political parties and lifted it, often in opposition to these parties, to the social level of society in general. Wilhelm Reich's statements in his correspondence with the organization of the psychoanalysts are still fully valid in principle and were, on the whole, confirmed by subsequent events. What in 1934 still sounded heretic has today become clear in psychoanalytic circles also: that psychoanalysis has sex-political social effects. Today, the pronouncements of "unpolitical" transcendental scientists sound rather peculiar.

In the report of the Central Committee of the International Psychoanalytical Association (*Internat. Zeitschr. f. Psychoan.* 1935) a painful event is left out. For the orientation of the members of the Association we complement the report as follows:

---

* First published in *Zeitschr. f. polit. Psychologie und Sexualökonomie* 2, 1935, 54-61. Translated by the Editor.

At the 13th International Psychoanalytic Congress (Lucerne, August 26 to 31, 1934), Wilhelm Reich was expelled from the International Psychoanalytical Association. This brought to an end the first stage of a hard struggle, of eleven years duration, for a correct natural-scientific psychology and theory of sex.

We cannot give here an extensive presentation of the motives behind this expulsion or of the differences within the psychoanalytic movement. This may be done at a time when further catastrophes in the scientific development of psychoanalysis, catastrophes which are bound to come, will necessitate a detailed historical explanation. Here we shall show only briefly how conservative scientific organizations of today fight workers who strive to take scientific research seriously.

The manner in which the expulsion of Wilhelm Reich took place is so grotesque as to appear incredible to the outsider. The Sexpol has developed the principle of not ascribing grotesque, seemingly senseless fighting methods to individual officials of organizations, but to focus attention on the objective circumstances which are at the base of such personal methods. If one wishes to understand this expulsion, one has to know the embarrassing situation in which the present administration of the Association finds itself. As an organization, it has to represent a science which is, intrinsically and in its theoretical origin, revolutionary. But the representatives of this organization are steeped in the ideology and the milieu of the middle classes, are convinced of the unalterability of present-day living to such an extent that they could not escape coming into conflict with their own theory; this has taken place to the same extent to which the world political situation turned reactionary and threatened any correct scientific work with destruction of the scientists. Furthermore, the leading representatives of psychoanalysis had never been willing to draw the inevitable practical consequences from the psychoanalytic theory of sex and from clinical experience. The administration of the Association had no grounds on which to object to Wilhelm Reich's scientific and clinical views. On the contrary, over a period of many years, members of the Association, in great numbers, considered his work (theory of genitality and character-analysis) as the consistent development of Freud's originally revolutionary theory. There were, then, no solid grounds for his expulsion. For a number of years, therefore, the demand had been made that he resign voluntarily. This he rejected, stating that he would never resign voluntarily. Then, in the course of many misunderstandings, an oppor-

tunity presented itself to rid oneself of the burden which Reich represented for the Association. True, the original goal of securing, unobtrusively, the social acceptability of psychoanalysis, was not achieved. Before the Congress, Reich received the following letter from the Secretary of the German Psychoanalytical Society:

> Dear Dr. Reich: On the occasion of the International Congress, the Verlag (International Psychoanalytic Publishing House) plans to publish a calendar containing a membership list of the Psychoanalytic Association. The situation makes it imperative not to have your name in the membership list of the German Psychoanalytic Society. I would be glad if you could appreciate the situation and, setting the interest of the psychoanalytic cause in Germany above any possible personal feelings, would give your consent to this measure. Your standing in the international psychoanalytic world as a scientist and author is so well known that this omission of your name could not possibly do you the slightest harm, as it might to a tyro. Furthermore, with the recognition of the Scandinavian group at the Congress and your future listing in this new group, the present problem will become objectless. May I ask for your immediate reply?

Reich protested against this plan, and at the same time wrote to the General Secretary of the Association as follows:

> Dear Miss Freud: I have just learned that my name was omitted from the calendar which is about to appear. I learned about this indirectly and was asked to "consent *sine ira*" to this omission. There are many things in this which I do not understand and I would be grateful if you would tell me the meaning of this measure.
>
> To begin with, I don't know whether the accent is on the "consent" or the "*sine ira*." I also don't understand why, in such an important matter, I was not approached directly, provided that the motive was nothing more than certain tactical considerations. Further, I don't understand what was hoped to be achieved by this measure, since I have announced a paper for the Congress and see no way of keeping myself hidden there from the German public. Provided, still, that it is only a matter of "certain" considerations, the fact that one did not choose the way of transferring me to another group, and the further fact that such things are done without my knowledge, behind my back, makes me think that something ominous is going on. To the world, the omission of my name must signify that I was either expelled or that I resigned. Since I have no intention of doing the latter, and since, to my knowledge, the former is not the case, the present attempt to solve the difficulty cannot be successful. I had occasion during the past year to show that I fully appreciate the embarrassment that I represent but that, for objective reasons, I cannot do anything to eliminate it. I would like to ask you, therefore, whether the omission of my name had the approval of the Executive Committee, and if so, the reasons for this measure, and the reason why I was not notified; it is also important for me to know what is the connection between this measure and my membership in the International Association.
>
> I would like to ask you, at the same time, to let the Executive Committee know that I protest against this measure, and that I ask again that the present difficulties and moot questions be discussed, as is usual, before the open forum of our members and readers. As painful as the circumstances may be, for everybody concerned, I must protest against being quietly put away in a corner. The problems with which we are all concerned and which are decisive for the future of psychoanalysis and its field of investigation need not fear the scrutiny of the world.

On August 8th, Reich received the following reply from Anna Freud:

> Dear Dr. Reich: The program of the Congress is on press and will be sent to the members within the next few days. In the meantime, you will have received the communication as to the place of your paper in the program.
>
> Your complaint against the German Society I am referring to Dr. Jones. I did not know anything about the whole affair, and I am asking Jones whether he did. He will communicate with you directly.

On the eve of the Congress, Reich accidentally met a certain member of the Executive Committee in the lobby of the Congress building. This man told Reich privately that, a week previously, the German Psychoanalytic Society had decided on the expulsion of Reich, but that this expulsion was a "mere formality," since the recognition of the Scandinavian group was expected with certainty also to solve satisfactorily the problem of Reich's membership. Shortly afterwards Reich learned that the former president of the International Association and of the International Training Committee, Max Eitingon, had brought about Reich's expulsion from the German, and with that, from the International Association, *a year*

earlier, in a *secret* meeting of the Executive Committee.[1] Of this, nobody had heard up to the time of the Congress. When the expulsion became known at the Congress, the members reacted in part with incredulity, in part with indignation, and in part with the consolation that the whole thing was merely a formality after all and that Reich would be admitted to the Scandinavian group. Nobody believed for a moment that the Executive Committee would confirm the expulsion. Very soon, however, it became obvious that it had been confirmed by the Executive Committee.

A decisive factor in the whole affair was the attitude of the Norwegians. The Executive Committee of the International Association tried to make the recognition of the Norwegian group contingent on their accepting the condition that they would not accept Reich as a member. The Norwegians, however, took the correct point of view: "We will not have conditions dictated to us. Make up your mind whether you want to recognize us or not. If you don't, we will resign." The decisive and upright attitude of the Norwegians (Hoel, Raknes, Schjelderup) made a great impression and intimidated the Executive Committee. They were recognized unconditionally as a group of the International Association; however, the Swedish group was separated from the Norwegian group, in order to remove it from Reich's influence. After his expulsion, Reich read his paper to the Congress as a guest.

It is not too much to say that the whole Congress was under the impress of this painful affair.

On the eve of the business meeting, in order to prevent a public scandal, a secret meeting was held of a representative of each of the local groups, under the chairmanship of Anna Freud, in order to "hear Reich's arguments." The whole thing was merely a gesture, for Reich's "arguments" were well known anyhow. He could only repeat there what he had said for years in his writings and in his correspondence with officials of the

[1] *Editor's note:* After the publication of this article, Eitingon wrote to Reich, in a letter from Palestine, of December 29, 1935, that this statement was untrue, but that the contrary was true: "As late as 1933, when I was still in Germany, I was against your expulsion from the German Society and kept pointing out to the Executive Committee that under my aegis a thing like that would not be allowed to happen." In his reply of January 9, 1936, Reich stated that he was very glad to hear that Eitingon had no part in the action of the German Society against him; he regretted not to be able to correct publicly the presentation in the article as long as no public correction had been forthcoming from the administration of the Association; and that he would be glad to have Eitingon's letter published in the *Zeitschrift für polit. Psychol. und Sexualökonomie*, if he so wished.—T.P.W.

Association: He could not give in to the demand of the Executive Committee that he resign voluntarily. If the Executive Committee expelled him, there was nothing he could do about it. He understood the expulsion from the point of view of the death-instinct theorists, for his own teachings had become so far different from the prevailing official teachings that there was no longer any common meeting ground. He declared himself, however, the most consistent and legitimate representative and developer of the original clinical and natural-scientific psychoanalysis, and stated that from this point of view he could not recognize his expulsion. He stated that, while this non-recognition on his part carried no organizational weight, he had to insist on the publication of the reasons for his expulsion in the official organ of the International Association. This was promised but not done. The later rumor that the Committee had "come to terms with Reich regarding his leaving the Association" only reflected the intense embarrassment caused to all those involved in it by the expulsion which had been decided a year previously.

Most colleagues in the International Association took the consoling view that, after all, the whole thing was only a formality and that Reich could become again a member of the International Association by joining the Norwegian group. The representatives of the Norwegian group told Reich that he would be welcome as a member. Reich told them that he would have to take some time to think over the advantages and disadvantages of becoming again a member; and that he felt it his duty to point out to the Norwegian members the complications which would be created for them as a group. The fact must be emphasized that numerous members of groups all over the world considered it a matter of course that Reich would again become a member.

The opposition which had been formed at the suggestion of Reich and was led by Fenichel, failed completely. Fenichel was in no way equal to the demands of the situation, which required an open and courageous attitude. It was shown that conservative psychoanalysts, who made no claim to being dialectic materialists but who were merely dissatisfied with the present-day course of psychoanalysis, were much more unequivocal than those who made such claims without living up to them. Later on, Fenichel agitated, with all possible means, against Reich's admission to the Norwegian group.

At this point, it must be said that dialectic-materialistic psychology is completely identical with personal sex-economy, and that nobody is en-

titled to call himself a dialectic-materialistic psychoanalyst unless he is willing to take the consequences of advocating the theory of sex-economy. The Sexpol disclaims all responsibility for the concepts advocated by Fenichel under the name of "dialectic-materialistic psychology."

The role played by Fenichel in the whole affair was highlighted by an article in *Imago*, 1934. Here, Robert Wälder wrote for the International Association an extensive review of the *Zeitschr. f. polit. Psychol. und Sexualökonomie*, which concludes as follows:

> There have been in the past many schools which use psychoanalysis, which take over greater or lesser parts of it while throwing out others or modifying them for their own purposes. What is it that justifies giving so much space and attention here to the present undertaking? Well, at the head of this movement is a man who, over a period of years, has made clinical contributions of great merit. While his works had a tendency to over-simplification and schematization, they have had, nevertheless, a fructifying effect on the whole. The revivification of the theory of the actual-neurotic core of the psychoneuroses which had become increasingly forgotten; the advice to proceed in analysis always from the most superficial layer, the behavior, and to penetrate to the unconscious only gradually, without short-circuits; the repeated admonition not to overlook, as is so frequently done, a latent negative transference which masquerades as a positive transference; the advice—exaggerated though it is in this form—to concentrate, in resistance situations, on the analysis of the resistance and to neglect the material which appears at the same time; these and many other things have often given life to discussions of technique and there are many who owe much of their technical skill to these suggestions of Reich. But past merits are no reason for tolerating any longer the errors of the present. It must be said quite clearly, therefore, that the present "scientific" endeavors no longer have anything to do with psychoanalysis and that anybody who follows Reich has no more right to point to psychoanalysis than have any authors who use a piece of psychoanalytic knowledge, modified and with the elimination of other motives, for their own purposes.

In the first number of the *Zeitschr. f. polit. Psychol. und Sexualökonomie* Otto Fenichel had published an article, "Die Psychoanalyse als Keim einer dialektischen materialistischen Psychologie." In the vigorous refutation of the Zeitschrift and its authors who are named, such as Reich and Parell, neither Otto Fenichel nor his article are mentioned. The future will show whether the interpretation of this fact by the Sexpol is correct. There can be no doubt, however, that the administration of the International Association is correct in its warning not to follow Reich on his path. For Reich has thrown overboard such things as the theory of the death instinct, the conservative moralisms, the contradictions between theory and practice, the academisms and the basic tendency of any conservative science to distract attention from the main problems by hair-splitting about inconsequential things. He has "isolated" from the structure of psychoanalysis precisely those things which not only brought psychoanalysis the enmity of the world but which also promise a great future for it: the theory of the unconscious, the theory of infantile sexuality, the theory of repression and resistance, the theory of the somatic core of the neurosis, the theory of the conflict between instinct and outer world, etc. These are most consistently applied, in theory and in practice, by the character-analytic and sex-economic specialists of the Sexpol. Reich's orgasm theory complemented these basic parts of a revolutionary scientific psychology by the economic point of view in psychology and created a valid counterbalance against the metaphysical theories of a will to suffer. His theory of therapy and his character-analytic technique provided the foundation for a future prevention of the neuroses. His theory of sex-economy made a definite break with the sexual bashfulness of official psychoanalysis, by providing the theoretical solution of the conflict between nature and culture.

According to the General Secretary of the International Association, Reich was not expelled because of his scientific discoveries and views, many of which, like the orgasm theory and character-analysis, were at variance with many theories of Freud; nor was he expelled because of his revolutionary point of view, for, it was pointed out, there were many psychoanalysts in the Association in spite of their divergent scientific theories or their Communist views. The separation from Reich, it was pointed out, was necessary because of the specific manner in which he drew social consequences from scientific work. What was meant here was sex politics. These consequences, and the combination of science and politics, were unacceptable to the International Association. In his criticism of the *Zeitschr. f. polit. Psychol. und Sexualökonomie*, Wälder takes issue with the following editorial statement:

> We refute the separation of theory and practice, of science and Weltanschauung or politics . . .
>
> We want to confront a consciously reactionary science with a consciously revolutionary science which openly identifies itself with the goals of the workers' movement and is at its disposal. We shall be able to demonstrate without difficulty that, in order to fulfil our task, we will have nothing to do but to do unprejudiced scientific work; the reactionary scientist, on the other hand, in order to fulfil his sociological task, must camouflage and distort the truth and permeate it with mysticism, he must, in short, relinquish the most primitive tenets of scientific work. We shall demonstrate easily that the separation of "what is" and "what should be" is artificial, that "what should be" derives logically from the recognition of "what is" unless one breaks with the principles of scientific work. Consistent unprejudiced science is intrinsically revolutionary and automatically develops practical consequences; socialist politics, basically, is nothing but *scientific* Weltanschauung in practice.

Wälder is the official editor of *Imago*. The International Association, therefore, bears the responsibility for the following statements:

> Politics and psychology have entered upon an ill-defined symbiosis here, from which, we are sure, psychology is not going to gain. We find here the formula, first propagated by Marxism and later taken over by other political schools, that knowledge is, and always should be, the expression of a being: true, genuine knowledge, according to this theory, is that in which one's own being is expressed. In Marxist literature, to which the periodical under discussion belongs, so-called proletarian science is considered the genuine science. Other, more recent schools, equally nonsensically, consider that science genuine which is the expression of another being, not economic but, say, national being. All these theories fail to recognize the fact that science, knowledge of the object, exists only to the extent to which the subject transcends its being. Science, one might say, is intrinsically bottomless. True, the expression of the subjective permeates the knowledge of the objective, but that is a source of error in scientific work.

How easy it is to talk in such transcendental terms! How harmlessly the objective, non-political scientist Wälder replaces the word "being" by "one's own being," in order to engage in "bottomless" science! But let us not talk about transcending, but let us ask Wälder a few questions: Did Aichhorn transcend his being when, in his book on wayward youth, he cleverly avoided the problem of the genital conflicts and sexual misery of youth; whether being was transcended when the theory of the death instinct was created; or Laforgue's theory that the police serves the gratification of the need for punishment on the part of the masses; or the theory that "culture" requires sexual suppression; or Glover's theory that wars could be avoided if one were to psychoanalyze the diplomats; or Roheim's theory that the woman obtains real gratification only if after the sexual act she suffers from an inflammation of the genital; or is it a sign of bottomless transcendental science if one has not the courage openly to meet Reich's critique of present-day psychoanalysis and instead takes refuge behind the formalisms of business meetings? Nobody can be blamed if, in these corrupt and dangerous times, he tries to protect himself. But one must protest vigorously against the usurpation of scientific competence by transcendental scientists. Science is no bridge game in a cozy parlor, as Wälder could learn from Freud himself!

It is not because of naive ignorance but because of the prevailing spirit in the International Association that the official editor of a scientific organization which calls itself radical can mention Karl Marx in one breath with Hitler, or Engels, Bebel, Karl Liebknecht, Lenin, Rosa Luxemburg in one breath with Goebbels, Göring and Julius Streicher. It is a problem of social pathology that the school of which Wälder is the mouthpiece behaves exactly like the group of so-called "German Jews." One gets beaten up but one remains superior. True, Freud's books were burned by Hitler; true, German psychotherapy, under the leadership of C. G. Jung, behaves in truly national-socialistic fashion towards the "Jew" Sigmund Freud; true, Freud's psychoanalysis, to the extent to which it is natural science, gains more and more recognition and advocacy in the revolutionary movement; but one remains superior. One sits between the chairs and consoles oneself with the objective spirit.

The International Psychoanalytical Association has the task of furthering Freud's natural science. The revolutionary movement the world over, in its fight against mysticism, narrow-mindedness and serfdom, must utilize all the knowledge produced by the bourgeois world. We know that the natural scientist Freud came into serious conflict with the bourgeois cultural philosopher Freud. It is a matter of protecting the former against the latter, of continuing his work and of putting it at the service of the

fight for freedom. It is a matter of providing the freedom movement with an army of theoretically and practically trained psychologists, teachers and therapists who are determined to fight mysticism in every form; of creating a secure foundation for a future sexual hygiene for all people; of opposing a nationalist and ethical psychology as represented by Jung with a functional, natural-scientific psychology; of making the results of the study of human structure usable for an alteration of structure; of developing the sexual needs against the mystical tendencies which govern people; in brief, there are ample tasks of vast significance. That is the point, and not such things as the narrow-mindedness of an editor who puts Karl Marx and Hitler in the same place.

For the same reason we wish to warn the few psychoanalysts who call themselves socialists not to forget the fact that a natural science is significant to a socialist only insofar as it—sooner or later—serves the conscious rational order of social existence. To those psychoanalysts who declare themselves friends of the Sexpol we hope to make clear that it is not a matter of "friendly feelings" but of practical work and aid, of drawing the consequences from theoretical insights unwaveringly, and of ridding oneself once and for all of those characteristics of bourgeois psychoanalysis which not only diminish or destroy its significance for the socialist movement but rob psychoanalysis as a natural science itself of any future.

He who cannot achieve this, for structural or social reasons, should stay aside. Nobody will blame him for his passivity. But those who engage in sabotage under the mask of friendship, who retreat to the famous "objective point of view," only suddenly to become destructive towards *us;* those, finally, who attempt to disguise the bad conscience which they develop towards scientific work and the socialist movement with alibis and "theories," these people will be fought and exposed by us without mercy. They will, probably too late, realize that their caution and their tactics have not helped them in the least. They will have to realize that in these times, which demand an all-out effort on the part of everyone, there are only two alternatives: Either to go on in the camp of political reaction, morally and scientifically ruined, or to take into account the consequences of revolutionary scientific work. We have learned not to ask of anybody more than he can give, but we cannot be expected to take lying down the indecencies and hostilities which inevitably result from a dishonest attitude. He who believes that he can deceive the revolutionary movement errs.

There are situations in the struggle which inevitably unmask and destroy the dishonest individual. It is, therefore, in the interest of the workers' movement if everybody, in time, recognizes the limits of his possibilities and acts accordingly.

The administration of the International Psychoanalytical Association has the reactionary trends of the times on its side. The Sexpol fights against the stream. History teaches us, however, that reactionary trends, may they be ever so impressive and intimidating, will, in time, disappear. A revolutionary reversal in the balance of strength in the fight for a new social order will bring no slight measure of embarrassment to the present-day representatives of science.

On March 17, 1933, a few weeks after the seizure of power by Hitler, Reich wrote to the management of the Internationaler Psychoanalytischer Verlag (the publishing house of the Association) as follows:

> Yesterday, I learned from the manager, Dr. Freud, that the contract according to which my book, CHARAKTERANALYSE, was to be published shortly by the Verlag, was being abrogated. This decision was made in view of present political conditions which make it seem advisable not to represent again officially my compromised name. I will not mention my rights as a registered and active member of the International Psychoanalytical Association and can even sympathize with the point of view of the publication committee and the owners as a precautionary measure, even though, as a scientific worker, I cannot approve of it. Beyond this, however, I feel it my duty, in the name of the psychoanalytic movement or, rather, a part of it, to point to the illusions under which the administration and the publication committee seem to labor:
>
> 1. Political reaction has for a long time identified psychoanalysis with "Kulturbolschewismus," and rightly so. The discoveries of psychoanalysis are in strict contradiction with a nationalist ideology and represent a danger to its continued existence. It does not make the slightest difference whether the representatives of psychoanalysis take this or that precautionary measure, whether they withdraw from scientific work or adapt it to present-day conditions. The sociological character of psychoanalysis cannot be eliminated by any measures whatsoever. The character of its discoveries (infantile sexuality, sexual repression, sexuality and religion, etc.) makes it the deadly enemy of political reaction. One may take cover behind such illusions as the belief in an "un-

political" nature of science: this will only harm scientific search, but it will never keep the political powers from scenting the dangers precisely where they are and from proceeding accordingly (*cf.* the burning of Freud's books).

2. Psychoanalysis, according to the consensus of opinion among its representatives, has cultural significance beyond its medical tasks and will play a decisive role in the approaching struggles for a new social order, certainly not on the side of political reaction; consequently, any attempt at adaptation or at camouflaging the nature of the movement can be nothing but senseless self-sacrifice. This all the more as a strong group of analysts is determined not to give up the cultural struggle but to carry it on. The existence of this group, whether within or without of the International Psychoanalytical Association, is politically compromising, even if its main representatives should be physically destroyed. I see no way for the International Association to disavow this group since, in contrast to other groups, it adheres strictly and consistently to the discoveries of psychoanalysis.

3. As difficult and complicated as the relationships between psychoanalysis and the revolutionary workers' movement may be, and as uncertain the outcome of the controversy between psychoanalysis and Marxism may be, the objective fact remains that the theory of psychoanalysis is revolutionary and its place, therefore, on the side of the workers' movement. The most important task, therefore, is not to safeguard the existence of the psychoanalysts, at all cost, but the existence of psychoanalysis and its further development. The first prerequisite here is to rid oneself of illusions, and to know that culture has only one advocate, that is, the working class and the intelligentsia which supports it and who are paying dearly today in the German Reich. The historical process has by no means come to an end with Hitler. The present phase of historical development must demonstrate the historical necessity and the sociological function of psychoanalysis.

NOTES

A WARNING REPEATED

As far back as 1942, we had to issue a "Warning against the application of sex-economic knowledge" (*Internat. J. of Sex-economy and Orgone Research* 1, 1942, 192). A number of recent experiences prompt us to repeat this warning, as emphatically as we know how. We have seen dangerous situations arise from the application of sex-economic knowledge in three groups of people: therapists without training in vegetotherapy; other professional people, such as social workers or teachers; and neurotic individuals engaging in attempts at self-therapy. In most of these cases, the danger arose from a complete misunderstanding of the role of respiration in vegetotherapy, the erroneous concept that vegetotherapy consists in "breathing." "Breathing" is not therapy; it is only a therapeutic tool, although an indispensable one. It is not enough to "have a patient breathe"; it is a matter of breaking the respiratory block. Doing this involves not only a detailed knowledge of how this block is established and maintained, but an equally detailed knowledge of the whole process of armoring, of which the respiratory block is only a part. If therapists, without this knowledge, "have a patient breathe," they act as a person who has learned how to sharpen a scalpel and then —without any knowledge of anatomy, physiology, pathology and surgery —were to proceed to do an appendectomy. "Breathing" serves the purpose of mobilizing biological energy dammed up in the armor. If, now, an untrained therapist "has a patient breathe," he may get a sudden release of energy with which neither he nor the patient knows what to do; because the release is not orderly, guided by the therapist according to the patient's structure, the result will be an acute anxiety state, suicidal impulses, a schizophrenic attack, or the smashing of furniture. There is, of course, a legitimate and fruitful "application of sex-economic knowledge." If, for example, a psychoanalyst, having become acquainted with the orgasm theory, does not take a patient's erective potency for orgastic potency but points out to the patient his orgastic impotence, he may be

able to remove this orgastic impotence to a far-reaching degree. This was done successfully in the early days of character-analysis, before the development of vegetotherapy. In this case, he has *applied* sex-economic *knowledge;* but—and this is the important point—his *technique* has remained the psychoanalytic one.

A social worker, who had understood that she should "apply her sex-economic knowledge" in her work, proceeded to have a client of hers "breathe." The result was an acute anxiety attack of a threatening character which necessitated consulting a vegetotherapist. Here again, there is a place for legitimate application of sex-economic knowledge. If, for example, a social worker finds that a mother makes her child neurotic and miserable by punishing him for masturbation, and she can convince the mother that masturbation is not sinful or "bad" but a normal expression of the child's sexuality, she has *applied* sex-economic *knowledge*, but, again, her *technique* has remained that of the social worker.

It happens that neurotic individuals, after reading our publications, "try the breathing," and then call up a vegetotherapist because they are in a state of anxiety and confusion. Now, it would not occur to anybody, after having read the description of an appendectomy in a textbook of surgery, to proceed to do one on himself (in itself not an impossible feat; surgeons have done it).

In the light of such experiences, we cannot warn strongly enough against the application of sex-economic techniques without the necessary training. Vegetotherapy is not, as many still seem to believe, a mere modification of psychoanalytic technique; it is something entirely different. It does not, like psychoanalysis and other psychotherapeutic procedures, work on the psychological surface, but on the biological core. It can only be likened to major surgery, and is as dangerous in the hands of untrained people as is major surgery in the hands of people who have not acquired all the knowledge and skill necessary to do a major operation. The Orgone Institute must decline any responsibility for the results of actions on the part of untrained individuals.

THE ORGONE INSTITUTE

SOME OBSERVATIONS OF CHILDREN

1. *The Witch. Anxiety and Naughtiness.* Per was five years old and attended kindergarten. He had not exhibited any unusual characteristics. He was a dark boy, small for his age. He had a lively personality, an

open face, and charmed grownups because he was trusting and droll. In his play he was active and easily made friends with his playmates, but little by little he changed. He stopped playing with other children. It was almost impossible to get him to go out and play. He grew pale and quiet, and cried easily. If the kindergarten teacher tried to get him to join in any games or other activity, he found everything tiresome. He refused all suggestions. The striking thing was that he did not show any anger; he simply did not obey, but became immovable emotionally and physically. He refused to be encouraged and wanted help with the slightest endeavor and sabotaged all kindly efforts.

This state of affairs lasted some weeks. To cheer him up his parents took him to the theater to see "Hansel and Gretel." When he came home he declared it had not been any fun, and when his parents asked him why, he answered that he didn't like witches. After this he became even more quiet and at night began to wake up and want to be taken into his mother's bed. Each time he said he was afraid of "the witch." It did no good to explain that the witch wasn't real. He said he knew that she wasn't, but when he saw her he believed she was real just the same. He continued to be naughty and refuse to play and the situation grew more and more irritating. There was no lack of advice, that the boy was outdoors too little, that his parents fussed with him too much, etc. The parents, who were fairly sensible, now decided to seek professional advice.

The physician diagnosed acute anxiety neurosis, which had come about through the evening at the theater. The witch who imprisoned Hansel and Gretel was the precipitating factor. But behind this must lie a latent and unconscious anxiety in the boy which it was necessary to discover. The physician wanted to know a great many things: how had the delivery gone, the nursing period, his habits of sleep and in what manner he had been taught cleanliness, what kind of sexual education had he had, his relationship to his parents, the relationship between the parents themselves, the boy's relationship to his sisters, his playmates, and the servants? How had his personality developed and had he earlier been eager to go out and play?

The mother recounted the following: the delivery had been easy and had taken only a few hours. In the beginning he cried a great deal until it was discovered that he was not getting enough to eat. The pediatrician had advised her to discover the baby's own time schedule, and after several weeks the boy nursed better, slept better and did not offer any

further problems. He had been nursed at the breast for three months, then breast and bottle for two months, thereupon, a mixed diet and the bottle until he was nine months old. Then ordinary diet and whole milk from a cup. The weaning had been effected without trouble and he ate by himself, without help, from one and a half years of age onward. He was a sparkling baby who charmed all grownups in his circle. His sleep was always good and became regular once his mealtimes had become regular. For some time, the jealousy of his sisters created difficulties. Everyone noticed him more than his sisters, and it happened that they took advantage when they were alone with him, to torture him in various ways. Once they were discovered hitting him on the head with wooden blocks causing him to cry bitterly. The jealousy was solved later and when he was two years old his relationship with his sisters became excellent.

For a long time he refused to sit on the potty; he was not forced to do so, and when he was one and a half years old he learned to go and fetch it himself. This happened very naturally. The other children used the pot, but it took him a while before he copied his sisters' habits. The parents had never impressed the children with disgust at the process of excretion. He was allowed to eat by himself and spill as much as he liked, until he began to copy his sisters and ate with more daintiness. He began to talk at an early age, and as soon as he could speak a whole sentence he demanded to know the difference between the sexes. He and his sisters bathed together naked and he noticed the difference quickly. When he was about three he played with his own body and there was a veritable hail of questions about why he was made the way he was, and like the other children, he was given a full explanation. His sexual play did not go as far as complete masturbation. He was impulsive and liked to be caressed. His parents allowed him to develop naturally in this particular. The atmosphere in the home was natural and sensible, and everyone was used to seeing the others naked. The three children had a room together, but when they were sick or anything of a special nature was going on, all the children came running into their parents' room and wanted to get into bed with them, and this they were allowed to do. This never became a fixed habit, however. When they were in good health, they always preferred their own beds. The boy was very fond of his parents, but most attached to his mother. The relationship between the parents was on the whole very good, and any conflicts were never discussed in the hearing of the children. The parents, however, had been less close around the period dealing with "the witch."

His relationship to his sisters was also good. They lived for long periods in the country and played mostly with each other. It was obvious that he adored his sisters and looked up to them, even allowed himself to be tyrannized somewhat by them. If they fought among themselves, it was noticeable that he did not strike back, but cried easily. When he was encouraged to hit back, he answered: "Then they'll just hit me all the harder."

With playmates of his own age he was the same way. He was not aggressive, was on good terms with everyone and made friends easily, and was quick to join in play. But he allowed himself to be led by bigger boys. Physically he was courageous. Both in skiing and swimming he went ahead with spirit and was considerably braver than his sisters. He liked to play outdoors very much.

He quickly became the servants' favorite. The maids had some difficulty in understanding a family where the children were allowed so much freedom, but the boy escaped these conflicts because he charmed the women completely. He developed quickly intellectually, had a quick understanding and a lively imagination, although he was perhaps a little superficial. During a wave of arrests [by the Gestapo.—Ed.] his parents and their closest friends were arrested in a highly dramatic manner. This seemed not to touch him, and he showed no signs of anxiety at this time.

The physician found very few indications of any latent conflict, but stressed the following: the boy strikingly lacked aggressivity. It was strange that with such a free sexual upbringing he had not arrived at any definite period of masturbation. The easiest explanation was that his sexual outlook was being influenced either by the servants or his playmates. Finally he showed that the boy had a characteristic bodily posture. Especially his shoulders and neck were locked in muscular contractions. When he used his arms he moved only his underarms. When the doctor tried to loosen this stiff posture the boy had an attack of anxiety and protested wildly against relaxing. One day his mother had him on her lap and they spoke of the witch. She said: "It must be something else you're afraid of." (He had by this time been several times to see the physician and sometimes had relaxed his shoulders in spite of the anxiety.) Suddenly it popped out of Per: "Pelle says that the penis will stay stiff forever if you play with it, and he says there is a witch in the woods who takes bad

boys." Pelle was a big strong boy, markedly aggressive, whom Per admired intensely. Pelle had been brought up quite differently, had been punished frequently and had not received any sexual education.

Per's outburst led to a lively discussion during which the mother and the doctor got an opportunity to correct his point of view. It also appeared that the housekeeper had said that the stork brought babies. After a few days Per began to masturbate at night and displayed a strong affection for his mother during the day. He changed character completely, his body posture became normal, he became sparkling, began to play outdoors again and became more aggressive. He also began to show opposition to his father and said: "I'm not afraid of you." This lasted a few weeks. One day when the father was putting the boy to bed he reproached him with masturbating too long. He did not stop him but said that he should not keep on so long. From that day the boy stopped masturbating altogether. His shoulders began to grow stiff again. He became irritated and began once more to dream at night. The fear of the witch did not return but he refused to listen to certain fairy tales, saying that they scared him. The father could not understand that his own faint opposition to masturbation could have such a strong effect, but the physician explained that, without feeling quite secure, he had probably masturbated so openly to see how far he would be allowed to go. The slight disgust which the father had shown he had interpreted as a prohibition, which it really was not. This time it took considerably longer to make the boy feel secure again. But after the father had explained to his son in a natural manner that he did not mean to stop the boy's masturbation, the state of anxiety vanished completely.

2. A little two-year-old boy wanted a tricycle since most of the neighborhood children were riding them. This want for the tricycle, which for one reason or another could not be fulfilled immediately, became an obsession with the little boy. Not only did his own family suffer from his constant claiming and crying for a tricycle, but he terrorized all the neighborhood children who had them, by either taking their tricycles away from them or trying to hamper them in riding. His parents were desperate but did not know what to do about it. One sex-economically trained neighbor who watched the child riding one day, soon found out why the child wanted so badly to ride a tricycle. The child was forbidden to masturbate and had found a very satisfactory substitute in riding. This substitute was out of his reach if he did not have a tricycle and the fervor with which he clamored for it was easy to understand.

3. A small child who does not yet talk and usually is very happy and cheerful and seldom cries, started crying one afternoon as if in great pain. All efforts to stop his crying were in vain, he continued to cry for almost an hour. He had not hurt himself, he refused to drink what he usually accepts eagerly when he has a little bellyache, and his parents were at a loss as to what to do to stop his crying. Finally, his mother remembered that two teeth had recently broken through and might still bother him. She put some of the soothing gum drops on these teeth, and after 5 minutes the child stopped crying and started to play happily. This is another example of the tragic inability of adults to understand the child that has not yet the means to make himself clearly understood for all his wants and needs, as described by Wilhelm Reich in his article, "Anorgonia."

JERRY'S CASE

At twenty-six, Jerry believed that he could never marry and have a family because he was "queer." Many doctors and sexologists would have agreed, counting him one of those legendary "natural" inverts.[1] But in Jerry's case, as in every other case of homosexuality where vegetotherapy has rediscovered the orgasm reflex, the drive for heterosexual intercourse has shown itself to be the only natural drive of sexual maturity. In reference to claims that the homosexual drive may be natural for certain individuals, it is significant that while a homosexual may be vegetotherapeutically readjusted to heterosexuality, it is impossible to redirect the sexual drive of an orgastically potent individual into homosexual channels.

Jerry had in his twenty-first year turned to overt homosexuality because 1) he had lost his orgastic potency through neurotic fear and repression and the development of a neurotic character, 2) his relations with the opposite sex were impeded by the resultant anxiety, embarrassment and unconscious contempt, and 3) his moralistic environment further interfered with his natural sexual expression. Due to the repression of pre-adolescent heterosexual experiences and the overwhelming guilt feelings he suffered as a result of homosexual relations, Jerry was

[1] The assumption of the existence of natural inversion has been reinforced by the failure of psychoanalysis to cure chronic homosexuality. Permanent psychic reorientation is dependent upon the re-establishment of orgastic potency—a biopsychiatric process. Hence vegetotherapy succeeds where psychoanalysis fails.

unable to remember that he had been heterosexually oriented in childhood. Not until the character and muscular armor was sufficiently broken up to release the natural sex drive were his repressed memories associated with this drive brought into consciousness. The first experience recounted occurred at the age of eleven and shows how consequential a boy's first ejaculation may prove to be as a determinant of the ensuing patterns of his sexual life.

> When Jerry had been half the summer at a ranch resort, ten-year-old June arrived. One day Jerry asked her to come and see the beautiful deer glade he had found, at the head of the creek where the spring was. They arrived hot and dusty after a long walk, and Jerry suggested a swim in the cool spring. June watched the boy's lithe body glide in and out of the water, porpoise-fashion.
>
> Later, as they stood drying in the sun, Jerry was suddenly aware that it was exciting to look at the soft, ripe plumpness of this girl-body. He took June's hand and led her into the deer glade.
>
> There wasn't room in the bed of grass to lie together without touching. The touching of their thighs led to embraces; inevitably, they had soon discovered things they had never known or even quite guessed at before. Then something happened that was too new, too strange and terrifying. June cried out, "Jerry, you stinker! You pee'd on me!" She ran and dove into the spring and when she came out she was sobbing. She put on her clothes without drying herself and ran back to her cabin alone.

To Jerry, this experience was insufferable. He repressed it immediately and violently—so violently that he did not have (or remember having) another ejaculation until he was twenty. (However, he retained subconsciously the image of his first sexual object—that of an immature girl with undeveloped breasts—an image which may have conditioned his later homosexuality.) Jerry now decided to let the girls alone. Jerry—who had spent many an afternoon of puppy-love with his childhood sweethearts—decided to steer clear of all females. They reminded him of his humiliation. If you let these new feelings express themselves, you pee'd on a girl. You couldn't help it.

When the primary sexual drive is blocked, a child will seek satisfaction of secondary drives; fulfilment will then tend to lay the foundation for the development of a perversion. At twelve, Jerry had a homosexual experience which he did not repress because he lived it out completely—as completely as he was able—and found it fulfilling. Later, however, when guilt feelings were aroused, he rejected it so thoroughly that he was unable to permit himself another overt homosexual relationship until he was twenty-one.

> One afternoon, walking home from the school athletic field, Jerry and Tim discovered it was almost as nice to kiss another boy as a girl. That night they went for a moonlight walk on a country path. When they found a safe hide-away, they lay down together, hugging and kissing each other, rolling ecstatically in the grass. They arranged for many rendezvous before Tim went away to school. Then Tim wrote from school that what they'd done together was wicked and they mustn't see each other anymore.

On top of these two sex-negating experiences, Jerry was faced with the most moralistic neighborhood in the city, to which his family moved when he was entering adolescence. Although Jerry had determined to steer clear of the girls, he was still strongly attracted to them. At his new school, the other boys teased him because he liked the girls; you couldn't be one of the regular gang unless you despised all females. Jerry began to be afraid of being considered a sissy and tried to act as tough and manly as possible.

> In spite of all these obstacles, Jerry fell in love with Cynthia, who had the desk next to his. After Cynthia's family got to know Jerry well, they allowed her to visit his home. In the darkness of an upstairs hallway, Jerry's desire caught fire once more. He kissed Cynthia fervently, held her tightly against his quivering body. Cynthia, terrified, broke into hysterical sobs.
>
> The girl told her mother and her mother told Jerry's mother and then the reading club found out and spread the story around the whole neighborhood. Jerry was in irredeemable disgrace.

Now Jerry was scrupulous in his conduct with the girls. Complete inhibition marked his relations with the opposite sex. As is so often the case with our young children growing up, his sexual development suffered a regression. Even kissing a girl now took more nerve than diving off the

high board; while in early grammar school he had been known as the "kissingest" boy in his class.

All intimacy with contemporaries strictly taboo, there remained the possibility of going to a brothel. A high school friend named Spud gave him the address of one and supplied him with a package of condoms. Perhaps this way Jerry could let himself go. It wouldn't matter if he pee'd a little as long as he wore a rubber.

> So Jerry went to a house of prostitution in the slums. He climbed a long flight of rickety stairs, fighting his nausea with every step. At the top, Mary—big and fat, heavily rouged, probably nearer forty than thirty—led him into a room that was bare except for a bed with a filthy mattress. Jerry was sick with loathing, but he had to go through with it: two dollars was a lot of money, and Spud had said it would make a man of him. Besides, he was certain this was something he had been desperately wanting.
>
> He lay down on Mary's formless body and tried for a long time to pee, because he vaguely remembered that was the best part of it. But he couldn't even keep an erection. Dripping wet, shivering cold, he finally gave up. Mary said, "Maybe you're just too young, honey. Don't let it get you down." Jerry didn't have any comeback. He wanted to say "Sorry" or "Thanks" or anything. But the frog in his throat was too big.

This failure to do what Spud had said any man could do left Jerry with a deep sense of shame. Suicide seemed the only course left. At this point, a chance to travel was most timely in providing ample opportunity for sublimation. Then at prep school and college-for-men-only, he learned that there were others in the same boat and managed to get along with no physical contact whatever, outside of the ever-increasing agony of kissing dates good night. Finally, his complex was victorious and he gave up making dates.

This general pattern of development is not at all uncommon. A boy who has developed passive-feminine tendencies as a result of a mother-identification must fight against these tendencies in order to prove himself a man; at the same time he is unconsciously fighting against the mother and all of her sex. Then, as plainly evidenced by Jerry's case, natural genital strivings bring such painful reactions in the form of

feelings of anxiety and guilt that the boy takes refuge in the homosexual defense.

At twenty, Jerry heard some college students talking about masturbation with vaseline. Experimenting in the dormitory shower, he rediscovered ejaculation. Then he met a young man whom he idealized. Jerry believed he sought friendship; but he soon found that what he had been craving was erotic fulfilment—in the only form of which he was now capable of expressing his sexuality. He was not long in discovering that while homosexuality afforded a certain amount of release from anxiety, it also intensified his guilt feelings and hence brought about new anxieties. At this point, vegetotherapy heard his cry for help.

There are moralistic hypocrites in the field of sexual guidance who would claim that Jerry would have been better off had he continued to practice abstinence until marriage. On the contrary, if Jerry had not affirmed sex in any form, a severe sexual stasis would have resulted, forming the basis for a far more serious neurosis, and his sexual misery would have been intolerable. Moreover, there is considerable evidence that outgoing love even in an unnatural form is a better preparation for a healthy married life than abstinence, which implies a prolonged period of autoerotism or the development of a pleasure-anxiety with resultant atrophy of sexuality. However, in a sex-economic society, there would be no justification for either course.

Sex-economy has the answers to the problems of adolescence that would have made it possible for Jerry to continue living the healthy, heterosexually adjusted life of his earlier childhood. It has the answers with which we can build a world where no girl will have to fall into Mary's profession or suffer the hysterical reactions to sex of June and Cynthia; where boys will not have to despise girls to prove they are manly, nor accept secondary drives in substitution for the natural primary drive denied expression. Adolescence, which in our moralistic, authoritarian society has so long been a period of emotional torture and life negation, must become —not for a few lucky ones but for all maturing youth—a period of self-discovery, natural sexual expression and creative joy.

We must concentrate on the application of sex-economy to prevention rather than cure if this new world is to become a reality. It is in childhood and adolescence that sex-economic regulation is most vital.

AGAIN THE COMMON COLD

The *Journal of the American Medical Association*, of February 16, 1946, reports the following:

> U.S.P.H.S. Launches Research on Cause of Colds
>
> Dr. R. E. Dyer, director of the U. S. Public Health Service National Institute of Health, who will supervise a prolonged research program to find the cause of the common cold, says that his investigators will keep at it until they have the answer. An initial expenditure of $50,000 is planned and it is proposed to find, in addition to the cause of colds, what will prevent and cure them. Dr. Dyer says this is the first "whole-hearted attack on the cold problem. Colds cause more disability than any other single disease. We estimate that each day in this country an average of 250,000 persons are out of work because of colds."

We know what causes the "common cold": low orgonotic potency of the organism; and we know what prevents and stops it: the orgone accumulator. 250,000 persons out of work, every day, is indeed a staggering figure. If the investigators are to "keep at it until they have the answer" it can be safely assumed that the "initial expenditure of $50,000" is a mere drop in the bucket. Let us assume that 100 times this amount is going to be spent before the investigators find it useless to go on: that would be $5,000,000. If orgone accumulators were built on a mass production basis, this sum might be sufficient to build some 250,000 accumulators. Assuming that each accumulator would be used by an average of 4 people, these accumulators could prevent or stop 1,000,000 colds at one time. Fortunes have already been spent for research in the cause of the common cold, without any tangible result. A professor at Columbia University led a research project concerning the common cold for several years. When asked what he did when he got a cold he said, as quoted in the press: "Go to bed." Nobody who uses the orgone accumulator regularly ever has to go to bed because of a common cold. One can only marvel at the tenacity with which mechanistic research insists on continuing on the wrong track.

A NOTE ON "SPECIFIC DISEASES"

The following passages from Florence Nightingale's *Notes on Nursing* are quoted in Bechamp or Pasteur by E. Douglas Hume (Chicago: Covici-McGee, 1923).

"Is it not living in a continual mistake to look upon diseases, as we do now, as separate entities, which *must* exist, like cats and dogs, instead of looking upon them as conditions, like a dirty and clean condition, and just as much under our own control; or rather, as the reactions of kindly Nature against the conditions in which we have placed ourselves. I was brought up by scientific men and ignorant women distinctly to believe that smallpox was a thing of which there was once a specimen in the world, which went on propagating itself in a perpetual chain of descent, just as much as that there was a first dog (or a first pair of dogs) and that smallpox would not begin itself any more than a new dog would begin without there having been a parent dog. Since then I have seen with my eyes and smelt with my nose smallpox growing up in first specimens, either in close rooms or in overcrowded wards, where it could not by any possibility have been 'caught,' but must have begun. Nay, more, I have seen diseases begin, grow up and pass into one another. Now dogs do not pass into cats. I have seen, for instance, with a little overcrowding, continued fever grow up, and with a little more, typhoid fever, and with a little more, typhus, and all in the same ward or hut. For diseases, as all experience shows, are adjectives, not noun substantives."

Another quote: "The specific disease doctrine is the grand refuge of weak, uncultured, unstable minds, such as now rule in the medical profession. There are no specific diseases: there are specific disease-conditions."

Says Hume, "It has been argued in answer to Miss Nightingale's sound reasoning that she was only a nurse and therefore not qualified to express medical opinions. This objection comes oddly from the devout adherents of men, such as Jenner, who bought his medical degree for £15, and Pasteur, who managed to obtain by a majority of just one vote a place among the Free Associates of the Academy of Medicine!"

IN MEMORIAM

Fritz Brupbacher

1874-1945

On January 4, 1945, Dr. Fritz Brupbacher died in Zürich. He was one of the few great fighters for freedom in this chaotic twentieth century. The news of his death did not reach me until December 14, 1945.

Fritz Brupbacher was a physician who daily experienced the misery of the unemployed, the anxieties of women with unwanted pregnancies and the destruction of youthful joy in living by brutal moralism, and who fought courageously against these evils. He was a true fighter for freedom. After having worked for decades, like other genuine revolutionaries, in the socialist workers' movement, he came up against the gigantic problem of the organized movement for freedom. In his book, 60 Jahre Ketzer ("For sixty years a heretic"), he gave a vivid criticism of organized "freedom," a criticism which is hard to match, from the factual as well as the literary point of view. He suffered heavily from the bureaucratization and the shallowness of the workers' movement of which a whole world had expected so much, from the unsoluble conflict between individual initiative and party anti-individualism. Like so many others, he was unable to find a solution.

His home was the meeting point of the fighters for freedom before and during the Russian revolution. When things began to move backwards in Russia, when rational sexual legislation was being sacrificed, piece by piece, when the old authoritarian order, year after year, gained more and more of a foothold, Brupbacher withdrew from party-political life. His greatness lies in the fact that, in spite of all disappointments, he did not resign himself but continued the fight on a different level, in full advocacy of individualism and in open fight against politiciandom. In his book, Seelenhygiene für Gesunde Heiden ("Mental Hygiene for healthy pagans"), he arrived at a harmony between the old idea of the international worker and joy in life, of unhampered human initiative and social responsibility and achievement.

In the last years of his life, Brupbacher could not be called either a

Socialist or Communist, an Anarchist or Liberal. Like many other rebels against the reglementation of freedom, he developed basically new concepts concerning the relationship of the individual to its society, a relationship which no longer has anything to do with obsolete party and other political clichés. We are all witnessing the maturation of a basically new social orientation. We are still far more the objects rather than the guides of this change. Brupbacher was great in his stand towards the social chaos, for he was able to withstand the tremendous tension caused by the decline of the party-political orientation in the problem of freedom. When I last saw Brupbacher in Zürich, 1936, he was full of questions and ideas concerning the development of a new kind of world. Whenever I was in Switzerland, I made sure to have the great pleasure of a talk with Brupbacher.

The noise of the emotional plague cannot make this world of quiet, peaceful work forget the loss of one of its best front-rank fighters, even though the daily papers still give preference to Hitlerist tom-tom beatings over the achievement of the Brupbachers.

December, 1945

Wilhelm Reich

REVIEWS

Ribble, Margaret A., M.D.: The Rights of Infants. New York: Columbia University Press, 1943.

There is so much excellent observation and advice contained within this small volume that it is doubly a matter for regret it should be marred by inadequate and misleading theoretical concepts. Dr. Ribble obviously possesses a considerable capacity for putting herself in the place of an infant and divining his needs.

Many illuminating instances of the tragic consequences which result from nongratification of the infant's intense need for mothering experiences are cited. As Ribble says, "Certainly we know now that the capacity for mature emotional relationships in adult life is a direct outgrowth of the parental care, more specifically the mothering, which an infant receives." The insufficiency of mere perfunctory attention to the details of physical hygiene and the necessity for "fondling, caressing, rocking, and singing or speaking to the baby" are constantly stressed.

The outstanding importance of oral gratification in infancy as an indispensable foundation for all later development is well brought out in the chapter on "Sucking." "The baby's initial sense of security, of pleasure satisfaction and success, is closely linked with his mouth activity." The need of the infant to determine for himself at what time and for how long a period he shall nurse is affirmed. Dr. Ribble's physiological explanations of the importance of satisfactory breast feeding are, however, to say the least, inadequate. She believes that this and other mothering experiences are necessary in order to bring about a proper transition from the placental respiration of the fetus to the postnatal type of breathing and also to insure the development of a healthy circulation, particularly to the facial muscles and brain. No reference, however, is made to the orgastic discharge of biological energy via the mouth by means of which the infant regulates his entire mode of biophysical functioning, although the writer seems to be aware of the connection between infantile anxiety and nonsatisfying oral experience: "Breast feeding is of the very essence of mothering and the most important means of immunizing a baby against anxiety."

She points out that "babies who have trouble with the establishment of sucking invariably show a disorganization of these same physiological activities, that is breathing, circulation, and muscle tone." In other words, the baby is suffering from a sympatheticotonic reaction as a consequence of his inability to achieve oral orgasm. Ribble is also familiar with the part the mother plays in the establishment of this condition. She states that "a large number of parents with whom the writer was closely associated found the subject of sucking extremely disgusting." She approaches the problem from a purely psychological point of view, though, and is apparently unaware that the mother who exhibits this attitude is disturbed in her own physiological functioning and consequently unable to give herself to the experience of nursing a child. Naturally, then, the infant will be unable to establish normal sucking behavior and will become either querulous and defiant or resigned and lethargic. The foundation has already been laid for a fullblown biopathic condition in later life.

In the chapters on "Elimination" and "Sleep" the principle of biological self-regulation is again adhered to. The absolute necessity of permitting the child complete self-determination in these matters is still far from being taken for granted in many circles. It is necessary therefore repeatedly to emphasize it, no matter how tired one grows, until at last the realization of this principle has completely permeated all sections of our society.

In the sections dealing with the development of speech and the intellectual functions the writer once more exhibits her acquaintance, in a general way, with the relation between lack of mothering experiences and retardation of growth. She has observed what she terms the "extensor reaction" in which the body of a frustrated and angry baby arches itself into a rigid tonic contraction in the manner of the arc de cercle of the hysteric. The "extensor reaction," she states, may often be observed after an unsatisfactory nursing experience. She describes a type of behavior in which the mouth and tongue of an infant who has just suffered such an experience will involuntarily and forcibly eject the mother's nipple while at the same time his small torso stiffens into the "extensor reaction." She does not appear, however, to recognize the function of this backward extension of the body as a defense against the intense anxiety aroused by the failure of orgastic oral discharge of energy. Neither, apparently, does she recognize the specific mechanism whereby this anxiety may be locally anchored in the musculature of the face and throat resulting in later disturbances or retardation of speech, and related conditions.

In the chapter on "Early Emotional Development" the author states that "as development continues, two other activities may readily be linked up into the early anger reaction—biting and kicking." In spite of this, she either fails to see the connection between oral frustration and biting or regards it as unworthy of mention. She relates that several young mothers with whom she was personally acquainted slapped their infants for biting the breast. In the reviewer's opinion the probabilities are that these young women correctly evaluated the baby's behavior as an expression of hostility and retaliation for the nongratification of his needs. Ribble, on the other hand, seems to regard this behavior solely as an indication of the child's advancement towards the period in which chewing will supersede sucking. Similarly, kicking is regarded solely as a preparation for walking, although "mothers interpret this activity even in the six-month's baby as an expression of bad temper . . ." I am not attempting to deny, of course, that infantile biting and kicking may not also serve as preparation for later developmental stages.

It is extremely distressing to find throughout this book that the author wishes to use her superior understanding of a baby's needs merely in order better to introduce the cultural demands for instinctual renunciation on a more mature level. She thereby seriously detracts from the value of her suggestions regarding the conduct of infancy and, as a matter of fact and ironically enough, actually defeats her own purpose by making these suggestions in the first place! Typical of her point of view is the following quotation: *"The human infant in the first year of life* should not have to meet frustration or privation for these factors immediately causes exaggerated tension and stimulate defense activities . . . *For the baby* the pleasure principle must predominate, and what we can safely do is to bring balance into his functions and make them easy. *Only after a considerable degree of maturity has been reached can we train an infant to adapt to what we as adults know as the reality principle"* (All italics are the reviewer's). In other words, cultural conformity is only to be delayed until later, rather than exacted from the very beginning as is customary. It is completely taken for granted that it is reasonable and just to demand that the child shall accommodate himself to the cultural requirements—no attempt whatever is made to inquire into the rationality of the social milieu into which the child is born.

There is more than doubt in the reviewer's mind as to the wisdom of a

parent's following Ribble's suggestions with regard to the conduct of the infantile period if she intends only to defer until later training in adjustment to the cultural expectations. A child who has had a richly satisfying infancy will find it all the more difficult to accept irrational requirements and instinctual frustration in later life. The conflicts will be infinitely more serious. No, if the parent wishes to force the child into cultural conformity, she had better begin at the very beginning and by repeated privations cow the baby into resignation and submission at an age when he is most completely at one's mercy. Otherwise, there is still a possibility that he may grow up to be fairly healthy in spite of one's best efforts at a later stage.

I should like to quote the following amazing sentence: "Aggressive behavior, like sexual behavior, is latent in human infants, and nature needs assistance in maintaining this latency until adolescence so that mental growth may get its full share of the energy of the young child." (!) Elsewhere the author speaks of the sublimation of infantile sexuality in a "good parental relationship." Such a statement is, of course, completely meaningless. A good parental relationship is necessarily sexual. One simply does not know what to make of an assertion like the one previously quoted in view of Ribble's repeated affirmation of the infant's outgoing behavior in other places. This particular quotation would seem to imply that not only does she approve of suppression of the child's outgoing activity but even believes that overt expression of sexuality does not occur in healthy children—that it is to be regarded as a pathological phenomenon! Yet later we have the statement that "Under ideal conditions in which the parents are emotionally well adjusted and the baby is wanted and loved, the sex impulses of the child do not necessarily become a problem until near adolescence *though they are definitely in evidence"* (Italics are the reviewer's). This seems to be somewhat contradictory. It is difficult indeed to determine just exactly what Ribble does mean. Sometimes one receives the impression that she would like to affirm infantile sexuality but lacks the courage to make a definite stand and insist upon its protection by society. Thus, for example: "It is a serious task to attempt to divert sexual energy into new channels of interest." (It is that.—One might go so far as to say it is impossible.) "Only by considering the 'rights' of infants can we forestall those 'wrongs' which later on society feels itself obliged to deal with harshly." One is obliged to ask why the writer felt it necessary to enclose the word "rights" within quotation marks, unless she does not wish her

book to be regarded as a serious defense of the infant's real needs. Surely she is aware of the incredible suffering and agony a healthy child undergoes as the result of interference with his normal biological functioning. But even this partial defense of the child's sexual needs is rendered worthless by her insistence on regarding these manifestations as pathological: "From the physiological point of view, as well as from the emotional, this premature breaking-through of the child's sex feeling is damaging." Ribble then goes on to say, "The parents who shrink in horror from the animal side of life make it impossible for the child to develop the very qualities of intelligence and spirituality that they think they stand for. If they are to be worthy parents of a normal baby, groping his way upward like any living thing, they will have to develop a new form of fastidiousness founded on knowledge of biological reality. There is no other way to guide the baby toward mental health." This is quite correct and excellent advice. Only the writer of these words has just missed an important opportunity to assist those individuals she addresses to be worthy parents of a normal baby by shrinking away in horror herself from the "animal side of life." As I have stated previously, it is extremely distressing to find a person of Ribble's superior knowledge and capacity for insight combining these qualities with what is essentially only a variation of the customary life-suppressing orientation.

Every young human being is entitled to the unrestricted exercise of his developing capacities for pleasure—in himself and in his surroundings, to the excitement of discovery and experimentation with all the manifold possibilities for enjoyment in life. Insofar as Ribble has defended the baby's rights in these respects she has performed a valuable service. It is impossible, nonetheless, to limit these rights to the infantile period and at the same time hope to produce adults who are happy, capable, and socially productive. All those individuals, therefore, who are actively interested in the evolution of society toward health and rationality will inevitably be forced to struggle for recognition of the infant's necessity to retain the right to freedom, spontaneity, and *joie de vivre*, as he passes into childhood, adolescence, and eventually, adulthood. Obscurantism and timidity have no place here. The baby who has had the unusual fortune to be born to a woman who is herself sexually happy with her partner will be unable to adjust in later life to a society which denies him that which is the most natural thing in the world—the basic right to love and be loved.

JOHN MANN

Edith M. Leonard, Lilian E. Miles, and Catherine S. Van der Kar: THE CHILD AT HOME AND AT SCHOOL: American Education Series, American Book Company, 1944, 1942.

Conceived as a textbook for teachers and a guide to parents, this presentation of the principles of modern education is a shocking commentary on the sex-negative attitude of the educator of today. He has convinced himself that he subscribes to the idea set forth in this book: "The new education seeks to make life a total process instead of isolated sections each independent of each other," and yet he is utterly blind to the fact that he sets the mold for this very isolation by systematic inhibition of the unfolding sexual life of the child:

> During infancy, babies discover the pleasing stimulation of their various sense organs. Among other reactions, masturbation is natural and common, but normally loses its attraction when the child becomes engrossed in the delights of the external world. If masturbation continues beyond this period, it may be a symptom of a personality turned inward. . . . There is probably something in the child's environment which has given rise to this manifestation of retreat from life. The source should be sought and the cause removed rather than the effect treated. . . . The wisest attitude is one of calm and seeming indifference toward what the child does. Simply be watchful, when putting him to bed, that his hands are outside the covers. Give him a doll or another toy to hold if he shows a tendency to masturbate. If this occurs during the day, see that his hands are kept busily occupied with constructive activities. . . . The best treatment of all is close observation, a relaxed point of view, and the constant supplying of things for the child to do which will absorb his interest so that the energy used in this inward auto-erotism will be directed toward a fuller and richer existence in relation to the world about him.

In the above statement, the educator betrays his ignorance of the fundamental nature of the child. He hopes to remove the cause of masturbation. Why does he not ask the cause of hunger and attempt to remove that too? Masturbation is no less a biological necessity. Why should it be normal in the infant and suddenly become abnormal in the slightly older child? To the sex-economist, masturbation is a natural activity in the child of any age, having its roots in the awakening sexual life of a growing organism. It is

not a retreat from life but essential to the physical and emotional development of the healthy child; moreover, as it gives pleasure, it does not lose its attraction until that time when a full sexual relationship with a loved partner is realized.

The "calm and seeming indifference" of the adult rarely deceives the child. Instinctively he knows he is being watched and reacts by becoming instantly on his guard, thereby setting the stage for the muscular tensions that have such far-reaching and deep significance. The close observation, putting his hands outside the covers, et cetera, engenders in the child a sense of guilt; a normal, simple act has suddenly become a terrible and deadly sin; and thus he begins life with a fundamentally warped conception of the central function of living. The common practice of diverting the child is but another finger of the same fork. To divert is never to touch the core of the problem. One cannot but wonder if this is not exactly what the educator wants in regard to the sexual question.

The "inward auto-eroticism" referred to simply confuses a psychological term with a biological fact. The child derives pleasure from his body, so he is labeled a "personality turned inward," whereas, in reality, he shows the vital proof of a normal, healthy individual. The "fuller and richer existence" he will live if he denies the fact that his sexual life is maturing and demanding expression as surely as his limbs and his mind are developing, is fraught with implication. The fuller and richer life invites the conclusion that its opposite is meagre and "dirty," and the question arises if it is here that the beginning of the tendency to relegate the sexual life of the human being to the shameful and the obscene is found.

The educator continues in his lip-service to an ideal when he goes on to say, "There should be no mysterious secrecy accompanying the frank answers to questions concerning sex," and fails again in the comprehension of that ideal when he declares, "Sex education begins even before the child walks or talks, and most authorities now believe that the best time to build up sex attitudes is before the child questions, rather than after. When the child questions, his emotions concerning sex have very probably been somewhat aroused." It is true that sex education begins before the child walks and talks, but it should be based on the right of the child to function on the sexual level that is appropriate to his age. What is the use in trying to do away with the "mysterious secrecy concerning sex" and, at the same time, attempting to forestall the child's questions when his emotions have been aroused? It is precisely *when* the child questions that he is ready for

sexual knowledge; the prepared information, diluted and colored by the adult's own fear and repression, is not only superimposed but can be very harmful.

The inhibition of the adolescent follows close upon that of the child. In an excerpt entitled "Boy-And-Girl-Silliness" we read:

> Occasionally even in the lower grades, especially if there are older, retarded children in the group, there will be boy-and-girl silliness, such as kissing, note-writing, pictures with signs, incessant giggling, and so on. Such manifestations are usually a result of teasing or home suggestion or stimulation.
>
> The teacher should seek to keep the confidence of the children. She may encourage council discussions of the naturalness and joy of a boy and girl friendship, which is the same as the friendship of two boys and two girls, but she should point out that our friendship and affection are shown by kind and thoughtful consideration, instead of by making each other uncomfortable.

To the educator who sees no difference between the friendship of two young people of the same sex and that of a boy and girl, it is not surprising that kissing, as a natural expression of adolescent love, is lost upon him. Nor would he understand the difference between incessant giggling, which is often an indication of sexual repression, and note-writing, which is a normal outlet in the attraction of one sex to another. Obviously, the teacher will find it a fruitless task to seek the confidence of the children if he persists in trying to thwart these natural desires, and assuming that because he is made uncomfortable, the children are too.

There is a simple and good chapter in the early part of the book on biological inheritance, written by Dr. Elmer R. Noble and Dr. Russel G. Leiter of Santa Barbara State College. It should prove of particular value to parents who may have had less opportunity than the teacher to study elementary biological facts.

Much attention is paid in the book to physical welfare, and a thorough analysis given of the different age levels of the children in relation to physical development, motor manipulative movements and characteristics, and so on. The sex-economist, however, would take issue with certain fundamental precepts the educator considers essential for the healthy child as, for example, in the matter of toilet training:

> The mother should not expect bladder control to be established much before the child begins to walk and talk. . . . When this training is begun, the child should be consistently introduced to the toilet at specified intervals of twenty to thirty minutes unless he objects, in which case it would be best to postpone the procedure until he can be happy about it.

It does not seem to occur to the educator that it is not a matter of the adult establishing bladder control for the child, but rather one of the self-regulation of the child himself. If he is not forced into toilet training, it will come of itself quite naturally at the time when the child is ready for it. There is not a youngster alive who will be happy about being made to sit on the toilet "at specified intervals of twenty to thirty minutes" and if, after constant pressure and compulsion, he appears to be content, it can only be for the reason that he has given up rebelling against forces stronger than himself and is adjusting himself to the authoritarian way of life.

It is consistent with the educational policy outlined in this book that the method advocated is the very one that produces the result the educator is trying to avoid:

> Care must be exercised that the child does not grow to inhibit his evacuation to the point of developing a difficulty in moving his bowels at the proper time, thereby establishing a tendency towards America's common ailment, constipation.

There *is* no more direct approach to constipation than making the child sit on the toilet every twenty to thirty minutes. A child wants to defecate when he has the urge to do so, and at no other time. He takes a natural healthy pleasure in moving his bowels but if he is forced into a bowel schedule, that pleasure is lessened if not obliterated. What usually happens is that the child simply becomes stubborn and refuses to defecate, thereby laying the foundation for "America's common ailment, constipation." Obviously, he is not even given a chance for self-regulation, and, in addition, the twenty to thirty minute schedule constantly interrupts any continuity in his play activities. Needless to say, there is no mention anywhere of the libido that is tied up in the repressed anal phase of the adult that results in this over-emphasis and concentration upon the excretory functions of the child.

Another manner in which regularity has become almost an obsession is in regard to eating habits:

> Regularity of feeding is absolutely necessary, and food should be placed before the child at definite periods, with no apparent attention to what he eats. . . . The habit of "piecing" is a dangerous one and should be avoided from the first. Many children nibble almost constantly.

Once again, no attention is paid to the self-regulation of the child. Irrespective of inclination, he must eat when food is placed before him. If a child is allowed to eat when he is hungry, to decide for himself what and how much he wants to eat, regularity will assert itself. Paying "no apparent attention to what he eats" does not deceive the child; again he knows he is being watched which, in itself, is enough to make him push aside his food. The fact that some children "nibble almost constantly" is an obvious indication that something is wrong with an imposed schedule; there is always a reason for nibbling and the cause must be found and understood. On the other hand, a child should be allowed to "piece" as much and as often as he likes, simply because it indicates a need that must be satisfied until his own regularity is established. The educator goes on to say that "efficient digestion depends upon regular habits of eating." This is a biological misstatement. Digestion functions at its best when the individual is hungry and the digestive juices are stimulated; if one is not hungry and eats, notwithstanding, the stomach becomes overloaded and the food cannot digest properly.

The disturbed child in this educational pattern fares badly indeed; we read: "Occasionally certain children will indulge in tantrums, for the same reason they are disobedient—lack of consistent training or a desire for attention. A dash of cold water in the face is an excellent remedy for violent tantrums . . . He should be left alone, without argument or persuasion, long enough to let his loneliness impress him with the idea that such explosions make him an outcast." It may be true that the child will indulge in tantrums for the same reason he is disobedient, but why is he disobedient? No amount of consistent training will eliminate his basic rebellion, only perhaps suppress it until a later date when it will break out in another form. It seems incredible in this day of psychological investigation that these educators of the West do not inquire into the basic cause

underlying the behavior pattern. A tantrum is simply the refusal of the child to accept some injury that has been done to him; it is a means of rebellion, a healthy and natural rebellion. If the result of this revolt is the punishment of the outcast, what hope has he for becoming a happy and well-adjusted individual? A dash of cold water in the face is not only cruel to the child, but is a symptom of the inability of the adult to understand or deal intelligently with the problem. It is in line with the total lack of perception evidenced by the method of punishment:

> The teacher must step in at the point where the child has not yet achieved control of himself and help him to self-control through a retributive punishment—isolating, tying hands, or some such thing which fits the nature of the misdeed.

Isolating the child deprives him of what he needs most, love and understanding, and the tying of his hands not only deepens his rebellion, but insures severe psychological damage.

It is typical of the character structure of a vast majority of individuals that they expect the following behavior from children that is outlined in this book:

> A healthy, natural selfishness is to be expected from the child who has not learned to live in a social environment. His first reaction to other children is often of a pugnacious nature. He will bite, punch, strike, or otherwise annoy them in his effort to get attention. This response is evidenced also in cruel treatment of animals and other living things weaker than himself.

Experienced sex-economists who have brought up children on the principle of love and self-regulation find no such indication of selfishness and cruelty in the child. On the contrary, destructiveness is reduced to its minimum because the child has known only freedom in his psychic and bodily needs. He has not experienced either a substitute affection from his parents, or rationed love from his teachers, but has been brought up in the awareness that the child is an individual from the first day of his birth, and has the inalienable right to love.

This is a long book and it is a sentimental book. Here and there are passages that are factual and instructive, such as the chapter on "Physical Characteristics." The bibliography is extensive and many books recommended are worthy of study. Innumerable photographs of children and their work fill the pages and one gets the impression that many of them are "phony"; that is, the work could not have been created by the children without an unwise amount of help from the teacher.

In the "Introduction" to the book we read: "The real educator knows that civilization is wholly dependent upon the stuff we send out of our schools," but if this type of education is to make up the stuff that is the warp and woof of our society, then we can only hope to eradicate it gradually, envying the little girl who disposed so neatly of her problem: "Mother, is God everywhere?" "Yes," answered the puzzled mother. "Well, then, Mother, is God in this room?" "Yes, dear," replied the perplexed mother. "But, Mother," continued the child, "is God on this table?" "Yes, I think he is," the mother ventured. "Is he in this mush bowl?" "Yes," answered the mother, "I believe he is." "Well, then," said the child as she turned the bowl none too gently upside down, "Now, I've got you, God, and you won't bother me any more!"

ELIZABETH TYSON

C. Anderson Aldrich and Mary M. Aldrich. BABIES ARE HUMAN BEINGS. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1938.

The sun has them blinking—the authors of this book as well as many other enlightened educators and pediatricians who are looking straight at the necessity of self-regulation for children and yet are looking at it with half-closed eyes. It is a good book and an encouraging book—as far as it goes. It vigorously opposes the common practice of bringing the baby up by the clock, and points the basic fact that the adult must relinquish his preconceived ideas of what is right for the child in favor of the baby's own native instinct and readiness. It emphasizes the need for the acceptance of the infant as an individual, underscoring the primary importance of "taking our cues from the baby himself as he pursues his developmental course." And yet these educators have missed the most significant cue of all—the sexual life of the child. They do not yet understand that it is impossible for the baby to establish his own rhythm if his sexual impulse is suppressed; that though they are entirely correct in their premise that it is of vital importance that he determine his own eating, sleeping, and eliminative habits, these cannot follow a natural pattern if he is inhibited in his expression of infantile sexuality. The life process functions as a

whole; one part cannot be free while the other is held in check. This ambivalent attitude of the educators points clearly to a character structure set in the mold of their own antisexual upbringing, and accounts for the fact that, on the one hand, they sense the root of the evil, the sexual taboo; and on the other, unwittingly perpetuate it. They write:

> If it were possible to keep to the perfect letter of our social regulations, youth would grow up without experiencing any sexual feeling at all until marriage, at which time they would be expected to adjust successfully to this complicated growth process. This is by no means what people actually do, but in spite of gradually changing standards it is obviously the ideal around which life in this society is still planned.
>
> Nature does not go about sexual development in this way, but, on the contrary begins its growth in infancy. . . . A baby who is born today among the bushmen of Dutch Guiana, let us say, where definite training in the development of sexual activity is a part of every child's education, would have a very different experience. It is quite possible that the elders of the village, on observing his natural interest in his sensations would nod approvingly and say, "The child is coming along well in his development."
>
> There is no doubt that shaming or spanking a baby for such behavior has a harmful effect upon his later conception of sex relations. When the maturing child feels the normal quickening of his sexual life, memories of these early punishments come up to make him feel ashamed and guilty instead of giving him a basis for security and satisfaction in the growth of his ripening powers.

It is indeed encouraging that these authors have insight into the fact that it is the right of every child to have approval and guidance in his sexual development and that guilt and shame follow close upon the heels of punishment and suppression, seriously impairing the functioning of his adult sexual life. But this insight of the educators remains passive; they have not yet been able to advocate a positive approach to the problem, partly because they do not yet fully understand the relation between the sexual life of the child and his whole structural development. Thus they brush aside the natural expression of infant sexuality:

> Babies have a habit of putting their hands into their mouths. So common is this practice that it appears to be an almost universal method of satisfaction to children, although it is likely to be distressing to parents . . . if persisted in for several years, it may result in a large orthodontist's bill later in life. . . . In the interests of the family budget there is justification for the various methods that are used to prevent prolonged thumb-sucking. But this habit may be considered first of all as a symptom that a child is not getting enough satisfaction of life, and as a summons to look into his daily routine to see that our treatment is giving him the needed contentment. Sometimes babies will discontinue thumb-sucking when their feeding regime is improved or when they are fondled and given more personal attention. It has already been suggested that thumb-sucking is a pre-natal sport, designed to try out and exercise the sucking muscles. If this is so, one would expect the habit to disappear gradually as sucking activities of a more satisfying nature are substituted. This is the actual trend and relatively few youngsters persist in it for any length of time.

The sex-economist agrees with the fact that prolonged thumb-sucking is a symptom that a child is not getting enough satisfaction out of life, but he disagrees that it is the "routine" which is at fault. It is the sex-negative attitude that is at fault. As the child matures in his sexual growth, he will leave off thumb-sucking for the more satisfying pleasure of masturbation, but if this is interfered with or forbidden, he will no doubt regress to the infantile and more accepted practice of thumb-sucking which now develops into a neurotic habit. If the fact were clearly understood that thumb-sucking is a natural and healthy expression of the early sexual life of the child, it would be apparent that there could never be "justification for the various methods that are used to prevent prolonged thumb-sucking." Instead, the attitude of the parents would undergo the closest examination and the cause of sexual suppression in the child discovered and remedied.

To relegate thumb-sucking to a pre-natal exercise that will disappear gradually as "sucking activities of a more satisfying nature are substituted" is to close one's eyes to the whole pleasure function of the organism. Thumb-sucking may well be a pre-natal activity, but is it not logical for the sexuality of the infant to be stirring as surely as the little legs that kick so vigorously? The same pleasure he experiences from his thumb in his mouth outside the womb may be equally pleasurable inside it. The unwillingness of the educators to consider such a possibility is consistent with their inability to come to grips with the sexual problem in children; we note the only reference in the entire book to masturbation: "Some time

during infancy the baby's wandering hands will happen to discover his genital organs. If he persists in finding this region of his anatomy pleasing, he may be termed a 'masturbator,' thus acquiring a blot on his baby reputation, one which puts him definitely in the 'bad' class and makes his family ashamed of him." The baby's hands do not "happen" to touch his genital; his awakening sexuality is seeking its normal outlet. Thumb-sucking often goes hand in hand with masturbation and finally disappears because it is followed by this next more satisfying phase of his sexual development; the only other reason for him ceasing to suck his thumb is due to the suppressive attitude of his parents.

But the educators are on the right track even though they have put the cart before the horse. The feeding problem, a question the majority of parents find most confusing, is clarified in terms that yield to the right of the child to determine his own method of functioning:

> Our greatest chance to encourage a child's growing ability to feed comes when we allow him full control over the amount he eats. . . . His plan requires first . . . we supply food when we hear him cry. Second . . . that he is cuddled and warmed by his mother while nursing. Third . . . that his particular likes and dislikes are taken into account as soon as he shows preferences. . . . Fourth, his meal is stopped when his inner workings have said "enough." His judgment in this matter is accurate even though we do not understand how he knows so much about it . . . a child's refusal to eat is often based on his determination not to submit to dictatorial methods of feeding imposed upon him.

The educators sense that pleasure, per se, is important to the child when they declare, "Feeding babies so that they enjoy their meals ought not to be so great a problem that we have to write books about it. Eating is one of the fundamental pleasures of life . . ." But again they fail to fully understand that sexual activity in the child is also one of the fundamental pleasures of life, and as long as it is suppressed and neglected, other pleasurable pursuits will be correspondingly affected. They are doing well in their efforts to do away with the rigid insistence that the child eat his spinach, but not until they realize that the experience of pleasure is the central function that governs the physical as well as the psychic life of the individual, will they be able to deal with the basic problem.

The natural growth formula is particularly stressed in the eliminative functions of the child. They observe, "The pressure of our conventions inclines us to build up within the baby a rigid taboo regarding the whole subject of elimination . . . Moreover in many ways, sexual and eliminative processes have been confused, and particularly so in the minds of children, thus increasing the prohibitive force of our feeling." This point is well taken, as so many of us fail to realize that our intense concern over the bowel movements of children are closely tied up with our own sexual inhibitions, which in turn are transferred to the youngsters. The educators highlight some of the bad effects of the common methods of toilet training:

> Let us see what happens under the nursery routine of training often used now-a-days. When the baby is from six to twelve weeks old, he is put on a small chamber while supported in his mother's arms, at a prescribed hour daily. For the first few times, a glycerine or soap suppository is inserted into the rectum and a bowel movement shortly results. In favorable instances the suppository part of the stimulus can be omitted before long, so that the reflex established consists of a rectal response to the position taken and to the feel of the potty on the buttocks. As usually handled the baby is not consulted at all as to the time chosen. On the contrary he is required to perform at some hour of the day which seems best suited to his routine.
>
> While this method appears satisfactory and convenient at the time . . . it is not successful in the permanent establishment of good bowel habits. First, it does not accomplish true training, and second, it ignores and abolishes an innate mechanism which is far more effective, the baby's own mass movement.

The sex-economist would add that there really exists no such thing as "training." A child uses his diapers freely as long as he chooses to do so, even if this need should cover a period of two years or more. Before any mention is made of the potty or toilet, there must be some indication that the child is ready for a departure from his diaper habits. This may manifest itself in any number of ways, such as when a child does a puddle on the floor and points to it with pride as *his* puddle—he has done this wonderful thing. A potty or toilet can then be shown to him as a place for puddles, but no issue made of it, he can use it or not at will; sooner or later he will ask for it. The same thing is true of bowel movements; the time will come when the child will relate the pleasure he has experienced in evacuation to the fact that he has done the bowel movement all by himself; thereafter readiness for a gradual break with diapers may occur

at any time. The important thing is the attitude of the adult in charge of him, that he cooperate with the child by treating the eliminative processes as a pleasure function, not as is often the case, as an unpleasant or nasty duty that must be performed. This apperception on the part of the adult, if he is working along the principle of self-regulation, will not only insure the natural functioning of elimination, but result in the cleanliness of the child becoming so well established that he will probably not be subject to the usual relapses, all of which will more than compensate for the mother's "irksome task of diaper washing" (p. 91).

The educators attack various other problems confronting the child, one of which is the question of sleep, they comment, "The parent, book in hand, who tries to make her ready-to-go offspring sleep out his allotted hours does not understand the dynamics of what she is up against." According to the principles of sex-economy, the child should not be forced either to rest or sleep, especially if he rebels against it; if brought up to follow his own natural rhythm, he will usually seek rest himself if he needs it. Of course, there may be special times when the child must be persuaded at least to lie down, or accustom himself to the night routine, but the way in which this problem is handled will determine whether the child is being helped to find his own way of functioning or being compelled to do something that is not right for him. The question of compulsion is well put in this book: "Most adults feel it necessary to force through any project they have instituted, regardless of whether or not the response of the child makes it feasible. They sometimes persist in hopeless attempts for weeks and months after experience has shown them that their efforts are futile, as though ashamed to admit defeat at the hands of an inferior person, the baby." Another aspect of the sleeping problem is also touched upon: "Occasionally children are confined too closely by their night clothing and bedding. Restriction of any sort goes against the grain of those who particularly enjoy freedom in their sleep as well as in their play." We would add to this that it is of the utmost importance to arrange the child's sleeping clothes so that he can find his genital with ease, as masturbation in bed is the most natural of activities for the child.

The educators are on the threshold of understanding the authoritarian family when they say, "But people, the world around, are afraid of the dynamics of their children and set up ways of life which attempt to control the driving possibilities of youth . . . we become involved in a program which seems to demand that all through the adolescent years we check

their desire for independent thinking, minimize their ability to use their own judgment, restrain their efforts to leave behind their childhood patterns and place a strict taboo on their urge for sexual fulfilment." Reich has pointed out with singular clarity the reason for this restrictive upbringing which has as its core the systematic suppression of the sexuality of children. Blocked in their sexual activity, the young are unable to tap the source of their energy and strength; physically and psychically it has become imprisoned. As a result, they lose their ability to become independent and develop a neurotic attachment to their parents and home. Anxiety and conflict thus find rich soil in which to grow. The unconscious purpose of the suppression of sexuality in the young now becomes apparent; by this means they are rendered dutiful and resigned and are now ready to fit into the strict code of marriage that society has patterned for them. They have already lost their initial drive to think for themselves, and they no longer are capable of approaching love with values that have developed out of their own rich contact with life. In consequence, marriage generally becomes a problem fraught with guilt, repression, and feigned emotion and, because the children are cast in the same mold, the tragedy is repeated in the next generation.

These educators speak truly when they say, "The greatest educator of all time will be the person who shows us the way to conduct children through the pre-school years so that the baby's eagerness to learn is maintained." Wilhelm Reich, in opening the door to the sexual life of the child and the adolescent, has become that educator.

ELIZABETH TYSON

INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF SEX-ECONOMY AND ORGONE RESEARCH

4 volumes (1942-1945) $4.00 per volume

Set of 4 volumes, $15.00

THE DISCOVERY OF THE ORGONE, VOL. 1

THE FUNCTION OF THE ORGASM

By WILHELM REICH

xxxvi + 368 pages Price, $3.00

CHARACTER-ANALYSIS

By WILHELM REICH

xxii + 328 pages Price, $4.50

THE SEXUAL REVOLUTION

By WILHELM REICH

xxvii + 273 pages Price, $3.25

THE MASS PSYCHOLOGY OF FASCISM

By WILHELM REICH

Third, revised and enlarged edition, 1946

xxiv + 344 pages Price, $4.50

ORGONE INSTITUTE PRESS

157 CHRISTOPHER STREET

New York 14, N. Y.